



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

The Gospel
According to the Hebrews
Edward B. Nicholson

10189

THE GOSPEL
ACCORDING TO
THE HEBREWS



$\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}_{L_1}) \cap \mathcal{C}$

THE GOSPEL
ACCORDING TO
THE HEBREWS

ITS FRAGMENTS TRANSLATED AND ANNOTATED

WITH A

CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL
EVIDENCE RELATING TO IT

BY

EDWARD BYRON NICHOLSON, M.A.

LATE SCHOLAR OF TRINITY COLLEGE, OXFORD
PRINCIPAL LIBRARIAN AND SUPERINTENDENT OF THE LONDON INSTITUTION



LONDON
C. KEGAN PAUL & CO., 1 PATERNOSTER SQUARE
1879

101 . ; . 2574.

(The rights of translation and of reproduction are reserved)

TO THE
REV. HENRY HALL-HOUGHTON, M.A.
(WITHOUT KNOWING HIM OR ASKING HIS LEAVE)

I Dedicate this Book

AS THE FIRST OUTCOME OF STUDIES TO WHICH I WAS LED BY HIS
FOUNDATION, JOINTLY WITH THE LATE REV. JOHN HALL, B.D.,
OF THE HALL-HOUGHTON PRIZES IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

~~10180~~

THE GOSPEL
ACCORDING TO
THE HEBREWS

from and notices of the Gospel according to the Hebrews : nay, I have not tried to acquaint myself with what has been said by every modern, even every German writer upon the subject. I have, indeed, presumed that Hilgenfeld would have gathered from his forerunners whatever was worth gathering in the way of illustration, and theory I did not want. With these reservations I think I may claim to have studied completeness.

For the style of my translations I must ask indulgence. Scrupulous exactness was so important that I have tried to be as literal as might be without being altogether unreadable. One thing I do most earnestly beg, that no one will be prejudiced against the claims of the Fragments to genuine evangelical origin by their look in their English dress. If, however, the Greek is read as well, or the notes containing a verbal analysis, or if the equally literal translations made by me from the canonical Gospels are compared, I have no fear of any such prejudice arising.

To any one who may have read and liked a little book in which I expressed certain views about English writing, and in which I tried to carry out those views as far as I dared, I must also excuse the *general* style of the work : it was written before, though published after the other, and I have had no time to write it over again.

It is important to add in what spirit I have written. The subject is one on which it is almost impossible to be without a fore bias. One may be biased against the Gospel according to the Hebrews by its absence from the Canon or by suspicion of the sects who used it. One may be biased for it by hostility to the Canon, by belief in an Aramaic original of the Gospel according to Matthew, by prepossessions in favour of the Nazarenes, by some of the Fragments themselves, and by a wish to recover some genuine part of the lost mass of early evangelic literature. I wish to say that I have been biased by every one of this latter class of influences except the first. But I have done my best to overcome this

bias, and have been painfully anxious to state nothing as probable which was not so, and nothing as certain which was only highly probable. Nor can I see what other deductions it was possible to make from the evidence before me. If a copy of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or of either of Jerome's translations of it, should ever be recovered—which, judging from the recoveries of the last forty years, is by no means out of the question—my hypothesis might be blown to the winds. But I do not see how any other hypothesis was nearly so probable on the evidence presented by the existing Fragments taken in conjunction with the existing evidence of ancient writers.

I have had much help from the thirty-three pages given to this Gospel by Hilgenfeld in *Fasciculus IV.* of his *Novum Testamentum extra Canonem Receptum* (Lips. 1866). His examination of the external evidence is, however, but a sketch, while his internal evidence (scattered through the notes) is for the most part, I think, quite destitute of value. He sees almost everywhere a form of narrative earlier than that of the Greek Matthew, but his reasons seem to me in the highest degree fanciful. There is no approach to systematic verbal analysis, and the impetuosity of judgement which affirms* that the Gospel according to the Hebrews offers to those who are investigating the origin of the canonical Gospels the long sought ‘punctum Archimedis’ is characteristic of the entire work. But I have had from it much help in many ways which I might not have got, at least without great trouble, from other sources, and I record the above criticisms only that those who cannot compare the two works may not suspect me of much greater indebtedness than I like to acknowledge. I must also acknowledge a heavy debt to his sections on *the Gospel according to Peter*,

* ‘Hebraeorum evanglium nobis evangeliorum originem investigantibus etiam nunc Archimedis punctum praebet, quod tot viri docti in evangelio secundum Marcum frustra quaesiverunt,’ p. 13.

the Gospel according to the Egyptians, the Traditions of Matthias, and the Preaching of Peter and Paul.

I do not know that *Supernatural Religion* (to the 4th ed. of which I always refer) contained anything of use to me which I did not afterwards find in Hilgenfeld: but I consulted it earlier and found it at the time very useful—it is indeed a valuable treasury of quotations from and references to early Christian literature. While making this acknowledgement I feel bound also to speak very plainly of the manner in which the writer has conducted his attempt to discredit the use of the canonical Gospels before the latter half of the second century. His omission and distortion of contrary evidence, and his dogmatic assertion of the wildest inferences, are so constant that if he be not altogether dishonest he must be prejudiced to a degree absolutely insane. I say this not merely from a comparison between his book and books on the other side, but from personal investigation of the sources of his very frequent statements respecting the Gospel according to the Hebrews—the early use of which he exaggerates most unwarrantably. Let no one think that the terms in which I have spoken of him are, in however slight a measure, coloured by *odium theologicum*. I hold that, whatever a man believes or disbelieves, if his conclusions are based on a full and, according to his own conscience, a fair examination of all the evidence at his command, he is not only none the worse but is far more to be esteemed than if he had sought to keep his own peace of mind or the approval of others by strangling his doubts in their birth. Nor do I wish to stop those who have not read *Supernatural Religion* from reading it: by all means let him do so who wills. But for the love of truth let him afterwards read Bishop Lightfoot's articles in the *Contemporary Review* for 1875 and Dr. Sanday's *Gospels in the Second Century*.

The Rev. S. Baring-Gould's *Lost and Hostile Gospels* yielded me some illustrations of Fr. 29.

To M. Niclas's *Études sur les Évangiles Apocryphes* I owe some facts and references about the Elkesaites.

I am much indebted to the abovementioned writings of Bishop Lightfoot and Dr. Sanday: all my debts to them will, I hope, be found duly acknowledged. And, although in Professor Westcott's *Canon of the New Testament* the wish seems to me too often father to the thought, I am by no means without obligations to it. The chapter on Justin, for example, was of itself enough to convince me that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was not one and the same work with Justin's 'memoirs of the Apostles.'

Professor Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* and my friend Mr. J. Theodore Dodd's handy and very cheap collection of *Sayings ascribed to our Lord* have given me much help in compiling *Appendix H*, 'Probable or Possible Fragments'; and I owe my warmest thanks to the Rev. W. H. Lowe for sending me his *Fragment of Talmud Babli Pesachim*: it has changed my view of Fr. 34 and Fr. 35 in *Appendix H*, apart from supplying my translation and most of my illustrations of them. I will here add that the only reason why I have not included the saying ascribed to Jesus by Rabbi Eliezer, also quoted by Mr. Lowe (p. 70), is that, although there is to my mind no doubt that the saying is genuine, there is also no evidence, and I think not much likelihood, of its having been reported in any Gospel. I call attention to it here because it gives an interesting glimpse of Jesus the Rabbi, answering strange puzzles suggested out of the words of the law by his scholars.

Cureton's notes to the edition of his *Syriac Gospels* have been most useful in pointing out to me correspondences between their text and that of the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The *apparatus criticus* of the New Testament text which I have used is that of Tischendorf's last edition; but the analysis of evidence for and against John vii. 53–viii. 11 is chiefly based on Dr. Scrivener's detailed exposition of it.

For the verbal analysis of the Fragments I have of course used Bruder's Concordance.

Not knowing any Aramaic, I have asked of my friend the Rev. Dr. Hermann Adler, the well known Rabbi of the Bayswater Synagogue, such questions as my written authorities left me in doubt about, and I most gratefully acknowledge his unvarying readiness to give me every information, and his very kind interest in my work.

To my fellow librarians, Mr. R. Harrison of the London Library, the Rev. T. Hunter of Dr. Williamis's, and the Rev. W. H. Milman of Sion College I owe thanks for many facilities accorded me.

Lastly, and very far indeed from leastly, I thank with all my heart the subscribers without whom I dared not chance the publication of my work. Specially thankful ought I to be to those many high dignitaries of the Church of England who, in the interests of critical theology, gave their patronage to a book of whose conclusions and a writer of whose religious opinions they knew nothing—simply trusting in the statement of my prospectus that I entered this field of literature 'in the cause neither of orthodox tradition nor of its impugners.' I hope that they and all others who read the book will find nothing in it to make them suspect the sincerity of that statement, nothing to make them suspect that it has been, even unconsciously, influenced by any religious opinions whatever.

LONDON INSTITUTION,
October, 1879.

SYNOPSIS.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

	PAGE
Scope and method of the present work	1
Evidence of IRENAEUS	1
,, CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA	3
,, ORIGEN	3
,, EUSEBIUS	5
,, „ to the use of this Gospel by HEGESIPPUS	6
Does Eusebius bear witness to its use by PAPIAS ?	7
Evidence of EPIPHANIUS concerning the Nazarene text	8
,, „ „ Ebionite text	10
Was the Ebionite Gospel written in Greek or extant in a Greek version ?	10
Explanation of the various beginnings of the Ebionite Gospel	15
Evidence of JEROME	17
,, „ respecting ORIGEN's use of this Gospel	19
JULIAN THE PELAGIAN refers to Jerome and this Gospel	22
THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA accuses Jerome of forging it	22
Evidence of THEODORET	22
,, BADA	23
,, NIKEPHORUS	23
SEDULIUS SCOTUS quotes it	23
Quotations from it in Codex Tischendorfianus III.	24
Not the same as the Gospel according to the Twelve Apostles	24
Summary	26

PART II.

THE FRAGMENTS.

Arranged in correspondence with the Gospel according to Matthew.

	PAGE		PAGE
Note	28	Fr. 19 = Matt. xviii. 22	48
Fr. 1, Ebionite preface	28	Fr. 20 = Matt. xix. 16-24	49
Fr. 2 = Matt. ii. 5	31	Fr. 21 = Matt. xxi. 9	51
Fr. 3 = Matt. ii. 15	31	Fr. 22 = (Matt. xxi. end?) John vii. 53-viii. 11	52
Fr. 4 = Matt. ii. 23	32	Fr. 23 = Matt. xxiii. 35	59
Fr. 5 = Matt. iii. 1-7	33	Fr. 24 = Matt. xxv. 14-30	59
Fr. 6 = Matt. iii.	36	Fr. 25 = Matt. xxvi. 17, 18	60
Fr. 7 = Matt. iii. 13-17	38	Fr. 26 = Matt. xxvi. 74	61
Fr. 8 = Matt. iii. (end)	43	Fr. 27 = Matt. xxvii. 16	61
Fr. 9 = Matt. iv. 5	43	Fr. 28 = Matt. xxvii. 51	62
Fr. 10 = Matt. v. 22?	44	Fr. 29 = Matt. xxviii. (1 Cor. xv. 7)	62
Fr. 11 = Matt. v. 24?	44	Fr. 30 = (Matt. xxviii.) Luke xxiv. 39	68
Fr. 12 = Matt. vi. 11.	44	Fr. 31	74
Fr. 13 = Matt. x. 25	45	Fr. 32	77
Fr. 14 = Matt. x.?	45	Fr. 33	77
Fr. 15 = Matt. xii. 10	46		
Fr. 16 = Matt. xii. 47-50	46		
Fr. 17 = Matt. xv. 24	47		
Fr. 18 = Matt. xvi. 17	48		

PART III.

THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE AND CONCLUSIONS.

1. Character of this Gospel	78
Contrasts with Apocryphal Gospels	78
Heretical corruptions of Epiphanius's Ebionite copy	78
Absence of such evidence against other copies	79
Estimate of the moral nature of Jesus and the extent of his knowledge	79

	PAGE
The Holy Spirit as the 'mother' of Jesus	79
Limited inspiration of the prophets	81
Anti-Ebionite view of their divine mission	81
Jerome's doctrinal acceptance of this Gospel	82
Application of similar tests to the canonical Gospels	82
The Nazarenes as described by Mansel and Neander	84
2. Relations to other works	86
(a) Uncanonical—	86
The Preaching of Peter	86
The Gospel according to Peter	86
(b) Canonical—	90
Critical analysis of each fragment	91
Summary of results	98
Not compiled from Matthew and Luke	101
Not the basis of Matthew or Luke	103
Writer's theory of identity of authorship with Matthew	103
Modern parallels	104
Temporary and partial purposes of the canonical Gospels	104
The note-book theory of Gospel-authorship	105
Writer's theory of relation to Luke	105
Chronological relation to the canonical Matthew	106
Harmony of the writer's theory with the Papiast and Erasmian views	107
General harmony of the external and internal evidence	108
Position of this Gospel in the second century	110
Note on the methods and results of the author of <i>Supernatural Religion</i>	110
Where other fragments of it may be hid	112

ADDENDA.

Comparison of EUSEBIUS with IRENAEUS	113
NIKEPHORUS CALLISTUS	113
Further note on Fr. 21	114
'Marcianus'	115
Length of the Gospel according to the Hebrews	116

APPENDICES.

	PAGE
A. Professor Westcott's statement of the external evidence	117
B. Papias and Matthew	122
C. The Gospel of Carpocrates and Kerinthus	124
D. Tatian's Diatessaron	126
E. Justin's 'memoirs of the Apostles'	133
F. Analysis of external and internal evidence for and against the genuineness of John vii. 53–viii. 11	135
G. Jesus Bar-Abba	141
H. Probable or possible fragments of the Gospel according to the Hebrews (with preliminary note on the quotations in the 'Second Epistle of Clement' and the Clementine Homilies)	143

See also note at head of p. 114, and p. 25 1.6

*CORRECTIONS AND SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

(August, 1881)

p. viii. l. 10. *For t read to.*
p. 3, l. 16. *After us add round.*
p. 8, 2nd note. *For Pascale read Paschale.*
p. 10, l. 4. *For the read the.*
*p. 21, last line of text. *For 9 read 8.*
p. 22, 3rd note. *For 88.) read 88).*
p. 24, 3rd note. *For iuxta read iuxta.*
*p. 30, note †. *The last two lines should read thus: and this was the reading of Origen's translator (Rufinus, about A.D. 400) and Hesychius (6th cent.).*
*p. 31, l. 2. *Strike out have.*
" l. 19. *Add comma before on.*
* " l. 11 from foot. *For di read dæ. Prof. W. Wright tells me that the Peshitta, as edited by Lee for the Bible Society, also has dæ.*
*p. 32, note *, l. 1. *After Jerome add (see last note).*
*p. 38, note *, end. *Add In Matt. xxiv. 36 also, which is parallel to the passage in Mark, 'neither the Son' is read by Tischendorf and Westcott-and-Hort and in the Revised Version.*
p. 39, l. 1. *Add comma after baptized.*
* " l. 3. *After up add from the water.*
* " l. 17 from foot. *Strike out the revised Latin,*
" l. 15 " *For the much read much the.*
p. 40, l. 2. *Strike out comma after saying.*
*p. 43, note ¶. *The exact letters of the MS. are το ιουδαικον ουκ εχει εις την αγιαν πολιν αλλ ει λημ*

A or Codex Tischendorfianus III. denotes two MSS. which are supposed, from strong resemblances between them, to be really parts of the same MS., although the first is in cursive writing and the second in uncial. The first comprises Matthew and Mark, but without the subscription to Mark: it is at St. Petersburg, whither Tischendorf brought it in 1859 from the East. The second comprises the subscription to Mark, with Luke and John: it was procured by Tischendorf at an earlier period than the former half, and is in the Bodleian Library. Most unhappily Tischendorf has not stated the place from which he obtained either half of the MS.: had he done so, it is just possible that we might be able to discover there a copy of Jerome's Greek translation of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, from which the marginal quotations were doubtless taken.

* Those with an asterisk before them are alone of any importance.

*p. 45, note ¶. The reference should be not iv. 13 but iv. 12, and the Syriac quotation, which has been very badly misprinted, should read thus:

اَيْمَانُكُمْ مَعْنَىٰ مَعْنَىٰ مَعْنَىٰ مَعْنَىٰ اَيْمَانُكُمْ اَيْمَانُكُمْ

* „ note **. *For twice, read twice at outside (according to most recent editors only once),*

*p. 46, last par. Matt. xii. 47 is omitted by N B and Cureton's Syriac, bracketed by Tischendorf, and put in the margin by Westcott-and-Hort. It is given by the corrector of N, CD and nearly all MSS., the Latin versions, Peshitta and Philoxenian Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, Aethiopic, the translator of Origen, and Chrysostom. Its insertion if not genuine would have been so utterly useless, while its omission if genuine can be so plainly accounted for by *homoioteleuton*, that I see no serious reason for doubting it.

*p. 48, note *. *Add* The exact entry in Codex Λ is Βαριωνα· το ιουδαικον νιε μωρον. This does not prove that this particular passage was in the Gospel according to the Hebrews : it may be merely intended to signify that Simon is addressed by Jesus as 'son of John' somewhere in this Gospel (see Fr. 20, 6). But the fact that all the other citations from it in Λ are citations of direct parallels makes it likely that the Gospel did contain Matt. xvi. 17.

* „ ib. *For hardly any read no, and after Jochanan, John add* (see Bp. Lightfoot's book *On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament*, 159).

* „ Fr. 19, last line. *For utterance of sin was found read there was found in them utterance of sin.*

* „ note †. *Add* So too Λ : το ιουδαικον εξης εχει μετα το ἐβδομηκοντακις ἔπτα· και γαρ εν τοις προφηταις μετα το χρισθναι αυτους εν πνι ἀγιω ενρισκετω [obviously a mistake for ενρισκετο] εν αυτους λογος ἀμαρτιας—‘The Jewish has consecutively after seventy times seven “for likewise in the prophets, after that they were anointed by the Holy Spirit, there was found in them utterance of sin.”’ Here there are two slight differences from Jerome's Latin. ‘Was found’ is not in the aorist but the imperfect, implying frequency : but, as Aramaic had only one past tense, that was a matter entirely of feeling in the translator. And the words ‘in them’ are added, which I conclude to be genuine because there was no temptation to a translator to insert them, but there was to leave them out.

*p. 49, 1. 2. There can be no reasonable doubt that ‘Magister’ in the Latin translation of Origen = the Διδάσκαλε, ‘Teacher,’ of the Gospels, but I have felt compelled to render it by the equally ambiguous English word.

* „ note **, 6th line. *For master read teacher.*

* „ „ „ last par. (twice). *For Master read Teacher.*

* „ „ „ last line. *For he that is good is One' read One is the good.'*

*p. 51, 1. 3. *After into insert §§ and add new note §§ A phrase peculiar to Matthew, in whom it is very common.*

* „ note ‡‡. *For 'Ιωαννᾶ: cf. Ιωνᾶ read Ιωαννα: cf. Ιωνα.*

*p. 59, 1. 19. *Before Eusebius insert (seemingly) and for VA read B.*

* „ 1. 20. *Before Irenaeus insert the translator of.*

*p. 60, 1. 9. *For the passover to eat read to eat the passover.*

p. 60, 6th l. of notes. *For μεμφθῆνα read μεμφθῆναι.*

„ note §, 2nd line. *For ἐτομάσωμέν read ἐτομάσωμέν.*

* „ 2nd line from foot. *After 17 add* (the order of words only being very slightly different).

*p. 62, lines 2 and 3 of notes. *For Barabba (thrice) read Bar Abba.*

*p. 64, l. 22 from foot. *After eat it add with him.*

* „ l. 15 „ *Insert comma after oblatō and strike out comma after comedendum.*

p. 68, lines from foot 16 and 11. *For Mishna read Mishnah.*

*p. 70, lines 3–12, ‘From—settled.’ A reviewer in *The Athenaeum* having denied the accuracy of this statement of continental opinion, and Zahn’s words seeming to me, on reconsideration, of doubtful import, I have solicited information on the point from Bishop Lightfoot, who writes—‘The question cannot be said to be settled, though I believe it is in the way of settlement. This however is a matter of opinion. Meanwhile I venture to say that no one yet has answered, or attempted frankly and fully to answer, Zahn’s arguments in favour of the genuineness of the Seven Epistles.’

„ l. 8 from foot. *Insert comma before is.*

*p. 74, l. 1 and note *. *For devil and devils read daemon and daemons.*

p. 77, l. 6 from foot. *Insert comma before except.*

*p. 79, l. 22. *After Mark xiii. 32 add* (very possibly also Matt. xxiv. 36).

p. 88, l. 11. *For I had said read had been said by me.*

„ note *, l. 10. *For ἡναυτιοῦντο read ἡαυτιοῦντο.*

* „ note †. *Add* In the Epistle of Ignatius to Smyrnaeans, II. and IV. 2, the Doketists are represented as saying that Jesus suffered and ate and drank τὸ δοκεῖν ‘in seeming,’ to which τὸ δοκοῦν is singularly near. But it is possible that the words of Serapion should be rendered ‘having learnt that their mind was lurking in a certain heresy, from what has been said to me,’ although one would then have expected ἐκ τῶν λεχθέντων μοι to come immediately after μαθὼν. In this case Serapion would mean that they were heretically minded when they made their petition.

*p. 89, note ¶. On Leucius see Zahn’s edition of the *Acta Joannis*, lx.–clxxii.

*p. 96, l. 15 from foot. *After Matthew add*, to whom ‘the kingdom of the heavens’ is also peculiar.

* „ l. 12 from foot. *Before recall add also.*

*p. 104, 2nd par. *For that—former read those parts of the two which run parallel.*

* „ 3rd par. Dr. Scrivener (*Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, 17, 18) thinks it probable that some of the variations, ‘and those among the most considerable,’ in the New Testament, ‘had their origin in a cause which must have operated at least as much in ancient as in modern times, the changes gradually introduced after publication by the authors themselves into the various copies yet within their reach.’

p. 114, 3rd par., 3rd line. *After ‘And add it seems to me that,*

„ „ „ 4th line. *Strike out seems to me to have.*

„ „ „ 15th line. *Add comma after late.*

*p. 115, last par., 2nd line. On Leucius see Zahn’s edition of the *Acta Joannis* lx.–clxxii.

„ last par., last line. *For wirtes read writes.*

p. 119, 6th par., 5th line. *Add comma after that.*

p. 121, 1st note. *For* ‘form *read* ‘form.

p. 129, l. 11 from foot. *For* the “Gospel *read* **the** Gospel.”

*p. 134, l. 3. *The quotation from Dr. Sunday ends at margin.* ‘*Read margin.*’

p. 137, note. *For* Pentacostal *read* Pentecostal.

p. 140, l. 11 from foot. *For* foreign *read* forein.

p. 141, l. 14 from foot. *For* *toukev* ‘*read* *toukev*,’

*p. 142, 5th par., end. *Add* Still he may only have been known as Bar-Abba.

*p. 145, l. 6 from foot. *For* (*Skabboth*) *read* (*Skabbath*, 116 a.b.).

*p. 147, 4th par. Grätz dates Gamliel’s tenure of office 80-118 A.D.

* “ last 2 lines. *Read*—

and בְּרָא וּבְרָתָא כְּחִדָּא יְרָתָן
אֲנָא לֹא לְמִפְחַת כֵּן אֲוֹרִיתָא דְמָשָׁה אֲתִיתִי וְלֹא לְאָוָסֶה עַל אֲוֹרִיתָא
דְמָשָׁה אֲתִיתִתְ

*p. 148, note §. The reference, a copied one, is wrong : it should be *Comm. in Matt.* (3. 762). In Migne’s edition the order is each time προστέθησεν ὑμῖν.

Origen does also quote the passage in *De Orat.* § 2 (l. 197-8) but without the words ‘For Jesus said to his disciples.’ Similarly also in § 14 (l. 219). In both places we have the order ὑμῖν προστέθησεν each time.

The reference to his book *Against Celsus* is to vii. § 44 (3. 762). A further reference (2. 260) given by Tischendorf I cannot trace.

“ last line. *For* *reat* *read* great.

*p. 149, 4th line of notes. *For* 158 *read* 150.

This number denoted the p. in Sylburg’s edition, but a better reference is to Potter’s ed., 416.

*p. 150. *Add new fragment and note—*

** 42 a Matt, x. 8. Accept not anything from any man, and possess not any thing in this world.

** *Doctrine of Addæns*, Wright’s *Ancient Syriac Documents*, 20, ‘the word of Christ, which he spake to us, “Accept, &c.”’

Matt. x. 8, 9 has ‘Without fee [lit. of a gift] ye received, without fee [lit. of a gift] give.’

p. 153, l. 14 from foot. *Strike out comma after say.*

* p. 154, l. 7 of notes. *For* no known MS. *read* no pure MS., save perhaps **one**.

* “ l. 20 of notes. *After* note add in the case of the Philoxenian.

* “ end of 1st note. Cf. *De Imitatione Christi* iii. 23 § 3, ‘Elige semper minus quam plus habere. Quaere semper inferiorem locum et omnibus subesse,’ ‘Choose thou always to have less rather than more. Seek thou always a lower place and to be below all.’ The second sentence might refer to the parallel passage in Luke, but there is nothing in Luke to answer to the first sentence.

*p. 155, l. 2 from foot. *Add* His words are given by Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 22.

p. 156, notes, par. 7 and par. 11. *For* Johannes *read* Iohannes.

p. 158, 4th par. *For* Johannes *read* Iohannes.

* “ 7th par., 6th line. *For* whoever he may be *read* who wrote near the end of the 9th cent.

* “ 7th par., last line. *For* *Hist.* at beginning *read* *Hist. Manich.*, pref. § 2, end.

p. 161, l. 23 from foot. *For* foreign *read* forein.

For Peshitta *read* everywhere Peshitta.

THE
GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS.

I.

THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

‘THE GOSPEL according to the Hebrews’ is the name of a Gospel of which only some thirty known fragments have come down to our day. It is my object to gather and examine the statements and opinions of ancient writers about this lost Gospel; to arrange, translate, and illustrate its fragments; lastly, to analyse the internal evidence presented by the fragments, and, comparing it with the external evidence, to see whether it enables us to shape any likely hypothesis as to the character and origin of the work to which they belonged.

*IENNAEUS is the first extant writer who refers to the Gospel according to the Hebrews. To make his reference intelligible it is needful first to say that the early Church believed Matthew to have written his Gospel in ‘Hebrew,’†

* Born and educated in Asia about 120–40 A.D., pupil of Polycarp and Papias, made Bishop of Lyon in 177, still living in 197, supposed to have been martyred in 202.

† The real Hebrew had long been a dead speech, but the name was commonly given to Syro-Chaldaic, or Aramaic—as it is now generally termed. Thus, in Acts xxi. 40 and xxii. 2, Paul is said to have spoken to the people ‘in the Hebrew tongue,’ and Jerome, who speaks of the Gospel according to the Hebrews as ‘written indeed in the Chaldee and Syriac language, but with Hebrew letters’ (*Dial. adv. Pelag.* lib. iii.), elsewhere speaks of it as ‘written in the Hebrew language’ (*Comm. in Isai.* lib. iv.—on Is. xi. 2).

that is, Aramaic. Papias, who can scarcely have written later, and may have written a good deal earlier, than 140 A.D.,* says that ‘Matthew composed the oracles in the Hebrew speech, and each interpreted them as he was able.’ † All other ancient writers agree with Papias. ‡ ‘Of the Greek translator they say nothing, but no one suggests that it was Matthew himself,’ says Tregelles (*Horne’s Introduction*, iv. 420).

Irenaeus, then, writing about 180–90 A.D., says of the Ebionites, a Palestinian sect, that ‘they use that Gospel only which is according to Matthew.’ § We shall hereafter see that the Gospel of the Ebionites was the Gospel according to the Hebrews, that it was in Aramaic, was attributed to Matthew, and was in existence at the time when Irenaeus wrote. In a second place Irenaeus again speaks of the Ebionites as ‘using that Gospel only which is according to Matthew.’ || It is quite clear, therefor, that he believed

* His date will be considered when we come to the evidence of Eusebius.

† Μαρθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἐβραῖδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράφω· ἡρμήνευσε δὲ αὐτὰ ὡς ἡδύνατο ἔκαστος (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39). Bishop Lightfoot, in the *Contemporary Review* for August 1875, has cut the ground from under the feet of those who maintained that by λόγια a lost collection of discourses, and not the present Gospel, must be meant.

‡ Erasmus first challenged this belief. Most German critics are Erasmians, while maybe most later English writers of mark are Papiasts. Some remarks of my own from a neutral standpoint will be found in *Appendix B*, ‘Papias and Matthew.’

§ Solo autem eo Evangelio quod est secundum Matthaeum utuntur (*Adv. Haer.* i. 26, § 2).

|| A rather remarkable passage:—Ebionei etenim, eo Evangelio quod est secundum Matthaeum solo utentes, ex illo ipso convincuntur non recte praesumentes de Domino. Marcion autem, id quod est secundum Lucam circumcidens, ex his quae adhuc servantur penes eum blasphemus in solum existentem Deum ostenditur (*Adv. Haer.* iii. 11, § 7)—‘For the Ebionites, using that Gospel only which is according to Matthew, are convicted from that very Gospel of holding wrong views about the Lord. Marcion again, mutilating the Gospel which is according to Luke, is shown out of those parts left in his edition to be a blasphemer against the only living God.’

the Gospel according to the Hebrews to be of Matthaean authorship, and, as he nowhere says that Matthew wrote two Gospels, but, on the other hand, expressly limits the number of genuine Gospels to four, he must have regarded it as one work with the present Matthew.

¶ CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA writes—‘As Matthias in the *Traditions*, exhorting us, says, “Marvel at what is before thee,” supposing this the first step to ulterior knowledge; just as in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* it is written “He that hath marveled shall reign, and he that hath reigned shall rest.”’ The formula ‘it is written’ is, as the writer of *Supernatural Religion* says (4th ed. i. 236), ‘generally understood to indicate a quotation from Holy Scripture.’ **

†† ORIGEN, after saying that ‘the Spirit also had being through the Word . . . even if certain words seem to draw us to the opposite conclusion,’ goes on thus—‘But if any one admits [indic. mood, *προστεταί*] the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, where the Saviour Himself says *Just now my mother, the Holy Spirit, took me by one of my hairs and bore me up on to the great mountain Tabor*, he will raise a further doubt how the Holy Spirit that had being through the Word can be mother of Christ. But these words and this difficulty it is not hard to interpret. For, if he that doeth the will of the Father in the heavens is his [i.e. Christ’s] brother and

It is evident that so far as Irenaeus knew the Ebionite Gospel was not a corrupted Matthew. At the same time we cannot tell that Irenaeus or those from whom he drew his information knew anything more of the Ebionite Gospel than that the Ebionites themselves averred it to be the Gospel according to Matthew.

¶ Died about 213–18 A.D.

** Ταύτης δὲ ἀρχὴ τὸ θαυμάσαι τὰ πράγματα, ὡς Πλάτων ἐν Θεαιτήτῳ λέγει, καὶ Μαθίας ἐν ταῖς Παραδόσεσι παραινῶν ‘Θαύμασον τὰ παρόντα, βαθμὸν τοῦτον πρῶτον τῆς ἐπέκεινα γνώσεως ὑποτιθέμενος· ἢ κἀντι τῷ καθ’ Ἐβραίον Εὐαγγελίῳ ‘Ο θαυμάσας βασιλεύσει γέγραπται καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας [ἐπ]αναπτάγεται’ (*Strom.* ii. 9). The *Traditions* of Matthias would seem to be the same as the Gospel attributed to that Apostle.

†† Wrote 226–54 A.D.

sister and mother, and the name “brother of Christ” falls primarily not only on the race of men, but also on those diviner than it, it will not be more absurd than in the case of any mother of Christ so entitled because of doing the will of the Father in heaven that the Holy Spirit should be mother [of Christ].’*

In this passage there are two things to be observed. First, that in the words ‘but if any one admits’—*εἰὰν δὲ προσίεται τις*—the indicative mood is used, which according to the rules of Greek grammar implies that the Gospel in question *was* admitted by some people—these people being presumably within the circle of those whom Origen was addressing. Secondly, that Origen upholds and harmonizes to his own theory the most peculiar phrase in the most peculiar fragment of the Gospel according to the Hebrews which has come down to us: and the conclusion is that either he was disposed to admit that Gospel himself, or it was admitted by so many other people that he did not like either to disagree with it openly or to pass it by in silence.

The old Latin translator also incorporates in Origen’s commentary on Matt. xix. an extract from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, with the following prefix—‘It is written in a certain Gospel which is called “according to the Hebrews,” if, however, anyone is pleased to take that not as authoritative, but as throwing light on the question before us.’† Here the formula of quotations from Scripture is used

* Καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα διὰ τοῦ Λόγου ἐγένετο . . . εἰ καὶ λέξεις τινὲς περισπᾶν ἡμᾶς εἰς τὸ ἐνάγτιον δοκοῦσιν. Ἐὰν δὲ προσίεται τις τὸ καθ’ Ἑβραίους Εὐαγγέλιον, ἔνθα αὐτὸς ὁ Σωτὴρ φησιν “Ἄρτι ἔλαβέ με ἡ μῆτρα μου τὸ Ἀγιον Πνεῦμα ἐν μίᾳ τῶν τριχῶν μου καὶ ἀνήνεγκέ με εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ μέγα Ταβὼρ, ἐπαπορήσει πᾶς μῆτρα Χριστοῦ τὸ διὰ τοῦ Λόγου γεγενημένον Πνεῦμα Ἀγιον εἶναι δύναται. Ταῦτα δὲ καὶ τοῦτο οὐ χαλεπὸν ἐμμηνεύσαται. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Πατρὸς τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἀδελφὸς καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μῆτρα ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ φθάνει τὸ ‘ἀδελφὸς Χριστοῦ’ ὄνομα οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τούτον θειότερα, οὐδὲν ἀγοπον ἔσται μᾶλλον πάσης χρηματιζούσης μητρὸς Χριστοῦ διὰ τὸ ποιεῖν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς Πατρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἀγιον εἶναι μητέρα (Comm. in Jo. ii. § 63—Migne’s ed. vol. iv. 133). .

† Scriptum est in Evangelio quodam quod dicitur ‘secundum Hebraeos’—si tamen placet alicui suscipere illud non ad auctorita-

—‘it is written’; but a reservation is permitted to anyone who doubts the authority of the work.

This prefix, and the quotation which follows it, are not, however, in our Greek text of Origen, and may therefor be due, if not to the Latin translator, at least to some Greek reader who inscribed them on the margin of his copy, whence the translator rendered them, supposing that they belonged to his author’s text.

But, if it be true, as we shall see Jerome says, that the Gospel according to the Hebrews ‘is often used by Origen,’ we are strongly impelled to accept the passage as genuine.

‡ EUSEBIUS (*Eccl. Hist.* iii. 25) mentions first the recognised books of the New Testament; then those which were disputed, but recognised by most people; and, lastly, those that were spurious. He goes on as follows—‘And nowadays some have reckoned among these *the Gospel according to the Hebrews*, which they of the Hebrews that have received the Christ love beyond any other.’§ This implies (i.) that this Gospel was the accepted textbook of the Jewish Christians in general; (ii.) that its genuineness had only lately been questioned; (iii.) that only a minority counted it spurious.

In c. 27 of the same book, speaking of that division of the Ebionites which did not reject the divinity of Jesus, he says that, ‘using that Gospel alone which is called *the Gospel according to the Hebrews*, they took small account of the rest.’|| From the context it looks as if he was borrowing from and explaining or correcting Irenaeus.¶

Elsewhere (*Theophan.* iv. 12) he says—‘The cause, therefore, of the divisions of soul that came to pass in houses Himself taught, as we have found in a place in the Gospel existing among the Jews in the Hebrew language, in which

tem sed ad manifestationem propositae quaestio[n]is (Migne’s ed. vol. iii. 1294).

‡ Died 340 A.D.

§ Ἡδὴ δ' ἐν τούτοις τινὲς καὶ τὸ καθ' Ἐβραιόντος Εὐαγγέλιον κατέλεξαν, φ' μάλιστα Ἐβραίων οἱ τὸν Χριστὸν παραδεξάμενοι χαίρουσι.

|| Εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ μόνῳ τῷ καθ' Ἐβραιόντος λεγομένῳ χρώμενοι τῶν λοιπῶν σμικρὸν ἐποιοῦντο λόγον.

¶ See *Addenda*.

it is said, &c.* Here we see that Eusebius looks on the sayings attributed to Jesus in this Gospel as authentic.

In another passage in the *Theophania* he gives from ‘the Gospel which is come to us in Hebrew characters’ † a different version of the Parable of the Talents.

It may be remarked that both Clement and Origen had traveled in Palestine, and that Eusebius was bishop of Caesarea, in the library of which city (collected by his friend Pamphilus) there was a copy of this Gospel, as Jerome tells us.‡ We may therefore reasonably suppose that their quotations are not merely second-hand, and that, had it been on the face of it an apocryphal production, they would have designated it as such.

It must be added that Eusebius asserts that HEGESIPPUS used the Gospel according to the Hebrews. ‘He also adduces some things out of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* and the Syriac, and particularly out of the Hebrew language.’§ As the works of Hegesippus were then extant, and are quoted by Eusebius himself, we can hardly suspect this statement of being wrong. And unless it be so we have in Hegesippus a still earlier witness than Irenaeus. For we

* This passage is quoted from p. 234 of Prof. Lee’s translation of the Syriac version of the *Theophania*, not being among the scanty remnants of the original Greek.

† Τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἡκον Ἐβραϊκοῖς χαρακτῆρσιν Εὐαγγέλιον (Migne’s ed. vol. iv. 155). Prof. Westcott, Mr. Dodd, and the author of *Supernatural Religion* make no mention of this fragment, which I owe to Hilgenfeld, who says that it was first noticed by Fritsche.

‡ *Catal. Script. Eccl.* under ‘Matthaeus.’

§ “Ἐκ τε τοῦ καθ’ Ἐβραίους Εὐαγγελίου καὶ τοῦ Συριακοῦ, καὶ ἴδιως ἐκ τῆς Ἐβραΐδος διαλέκτου τινὰ τιθησιν (*Hist. Eccl.* iv. 22). The Syriac may mean (i.) a Syriac version of the Old Testament, or of books of the New; (ii.) the Aramaic speech—Aramaic and Hebrew being on this hypothesis accurately distinguished by Eusebius in this passage as they are by Jerome (*Adv. Pelag.* iii., quoted later); (iii.) some separate Syriac Gospel. But one is also inclined to conjecture that a careless or meddling copyist has inserted the καὶ before τοῦ Συριακοῦ; omitting καὶ the sentence reads: ‘He also adduces some things out of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, which is in Syriac, and particularly out of the Hebrew language.’

know him to have been a ripe theologian at least as early as 170 A.D., and Eusebius says that he lived ‘in the first succession to the Apostles,’ || which would place his birth at the very beginning of the century. ¶ Being himself a Jewish Christian, he would be fully acquainted with the book he quoted.

Eusebius also mentions PAPIAS in connexion with this Gospel. ‘Eusebius,’ says the author of *Supernatural Religion* (4th ed. i. 421), ‘informs us that Papias narrated from the Gospel according to the Hebrews a story regarding a woman accused before the Lord of many sins.’ This statement needs to be qualified: what Eusebius does say is as follows. After mentioning certain stories related by Papias, he writes ** ‘The same historian adds other incidents as having come to him from unwritten tradition—both some unknown parables of the Saviour and teachings of his, and certain other things of a more fabulous character.†† . . . And he also transfers to his own work other accounts, by the aforesaid Aristion, of the Lord’s discourses, and traditions of the Elder John. And, now that I have referred the student to these, I must perforce add to those reports of his which

|| Ο 'Ηγήσιππος ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης τῶν Ἀποστόλων γενόμενος διαδοχῆς (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 23).

¶ He is said to have died in the reign of Commodus, 180–92 A.D.

** Καὶ ἄλλα δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς συγγραφεὺς ὡς ἐκ παραδόσεως ἀγράφου εἰς αὐτὸν ἤκοντα παρατέθεικε, ἔντας τέ τινας παραβολὰς τοῦ Σωτῆρος καὶ διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ τινα ἄλλα μυθικώτερα. . . . Καὶ ἄλλας δὲ τῇ ἴδιᾳ γραφῇ παραδίδωσιν Ἀριστίωνος τοῦ πρόσθεν δεῖηλωμένου τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου λόγων διηγήσεις καὶ τοῦ πρεσβύτερου Ἰωάννου παραδόσεις. ‘Ἐφ’ ἀς τοὺς φιλομαθεῖς ἀγαπέμφαντες, ἀναγκαῖς νῦν προσθήσομαι ταῖς προεκτεθείσαις αὐτοῦ φωναῖς παράδοσιν ἦν περὶ Μάρκου τοῦ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον γεγραφότος ἐκτέθεικε διὰ τούτων (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39).

†† It is equally correct to construe ‘some strange parables of the Saviour and teachings of his, and other things of a somewhat fabulous character.’ But, as Eusebius quotes in example Papias’s statements respecting the millennium, and attributes them to his misunderstanding the accounts of the *Apostles*, it seems natural to suppose that he distinguishes the ‘fabulous’ element from ‘the unknown parables and teachings of Jesus.’

have been already mentioned a tradition which he has published in their name concerning Mark the writer of the Gospel.' Eusebius then gives Papias's very sober accounts of Mark and Matthew, adds that he quoted passages from the First Epistle of John and the First of Peter, and then says 'And he has published also another relation of a woman accused of many sins before the Lord, which *the Gospel according to the Hebrews* contains.*

Now he does *not* say that Papias quoted the story from this Gospel, but only that he told a story which it contains. Still he does not say 'which the Gospel according to the Hebrews *also* contains,' and at any rate it is clear that a story there found was at least as old as the time of a man† who can hardly have written *later* than 140 A.D., and was seemingly told by that man as authentic.

It will be seen that in the above passage Eusebius mentions the Gospel according to the Hebrews immediately after four canonical books. He *may*, however, be only giving a list of the *literature*, whether scriptural or not, with which Papias appeared to be acquainted, as contrasted with the '*unwritten tradition*' from which he drew so largely. Still even in this case we might have expected him to imply some distinction between this Gospel and the canonical books had he looked on it as spurious. But that he did not so look on it is to my mind clear enough from other passages given above.

‡ EPIPHANIUS follows Eusebius in point of date. Like

* Ἐκτέθειται δὲ καὶ ἄλλην ιστορίαν περὶ γυναικὸς ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἀμαρτίαις διαβληθείσης ἐπὶ τῷ Κυρίῳ, ἢν τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους Εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει (Hist. Eccl. iii. 39).

† Bishop Lightfoot, in the *Cont. Rev.* for Aug. 1875, shows that the compiler of the *Chronicon Pascale* who states that Papias was martyred A.D. 164 has named him in mistake for Papylus. From the facts that Papias was a hearer of Aristion and the Elder John, that he knew the daughters of Philip, that he is called the companion of Polycarp, and that Eusebius discusses him before Polycarp, Bishop Lightfoot fairly concludes that he 'was probably born about A.D. 60-70.'

‡ Wrote in 376 A.D.

Hegesippus he was of Jewish birth, and, like Clement, Origen, and Eusebius, he had spent much time in Palestine.

Epiphanius, then, speaking of the Nazarenes, says, § ‘And they have the *Gospel according to Matthew*, very full, in Hebrew. For assuredly this is still kept among them, as it was at outset written, in Hebrew letters. But I do not know whether, || at the same time, they have taken away the genealogies from Abraham to Christ.’ It will be shown by and by from the writings of Jerome that the Nazarenes used the Gospel according to the Hebrews, that this was written in Hebrew letters, and that it was regarded by ‘very many’ or ‘most’ (*plerique*) as according to Matthew.

Epiphanius fancied that the genealogies *might* be wanting, because he had found them absent from Ebionite copies, and it is not creditable to him that at his see of Salamis in Cyprus he did not take the trouble of getting information on this point from his friends in Syria.

It is clear that, if he had ever seen a Nazarene copy of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, he had not examined it properly, and his evidence must be taken as mere hearsay. Still it is the hearsay of a man who must have heard the Nazarene Gospel many times spoken of in the countries in which his life was spent, and who was so bitter a foe to

§ “Ἐχουσι δὲ τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγέλιον πληρέστατον Ἐβραϊστὶ· παρ’ αὐτοῖς γὰρ σαφῶς τοῦτο, καθὼς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐγράφη, ‘Ἐβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν ἔτι σώζεται. Οὐκ οἶδα δὲ εἰ καὶ τὰς γενεαλογίας τὰς ἡπὺ Ἀβραὰμ ἄχρι Χριστοῦ περιεῖλον (*Haer. xxix.* 9).

|| *Kai*, ‘also.’ ‘They too’ (like the Ebionites) would of course require *kai* *aντοι*. I was tempted to render ‘And I do not know whether they have even &c.,’ but *kai* cannot mean ‘so much as,’ which would be the meaning of ‘even’ in this case: Madvig’s *Greek Syntax* and Winer’s *Grammar* give no such instance. Bishop Ellicott (quoted in a note by Dr. Moulton on p. 544 of his 1877 edition of Winer) does indeed reckon among the uses of *kai* in the New Testament a ‘descensive’ use—referring to Gal. iii. 4 and Eph. v. 12. But in Gal. iii. 4 this interpretation is needless and is rejected by (for example) Bishop Lightfoot, while in Eph. v. 12 *kai λέγειν*, ‘even to speak of,’ although it can be paraphrased by ‘so much as to speak of,’ means at its root ‘not only to take part in and witness, but ALSO to speak of.’

sectarians that he would not have failed to remember and record anything which he had heard to its prejudice.

He goes on to speak of the Ebionites: ‘And these too receive the *Gospel according to Matthew*; for this they too, as also the Kerinthians and Merinthians, use to the exclusion of the rest. And they call it “according to the Hebrews,” to tell the truth because Matthew alone in the New Covenant set both the exposition and preaching of the Gospel in Hebrew speech and Hebrew characters.’*

Presently he goes off at a tangent into a long story of a Jew named Joseph, who found in a library ‘*the Gospel according to John* translated from Greek into Hebrew speech, and the *Acts of the Apostles*—nevertheless after these reading also that according to Matthew, which was an original Hebrew work.’† He then observes that he has been led into this digression by the mention of Matthew’s Gospel, and comes back to speak of the Ebionites.

Epiphanius, therefor, although he knew of two books of the New Testament having been translated into Hebrew, never for a moment had any idea that the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* was a translation from the Greek.

It is in connexion with these two passages that we shall find it most convenient to consider the question of the lan-

* Καὶ δέχονται μὲν καὶ αὐτοὶ τὸ κατὰ Μαθαῖον Εὐαγγέλιον· τούτῳ γὰρ καὶ αὐτοί, ὡς καὶ οἱ κατὰ Κήρυκον καὶ Μήρικον, χρῶνται μόνῳ. Καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὸν ‘κατὰ Ἐβραίους,’ ὡς τὰ ἀληθῆ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν ὅτι Μαθαῖος μόνος Ἐβραϊστὶ καὶ Ἐβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ ἐποίησατο τὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔκθεσίν τε καὶ κήρυγμα (*Haer. xxx.* 3).

† Τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην Εὐαγγέλιον ἀπὸ Ἐλλάδος εἰς Ἐβραΐδα φωνὴν μεταληφθὲν ηὔρατο καὶ τὰς τῶν Ἀποστόλων Πράξεις, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ κατὰ Μαθαῖον Ἐβραϊκὸν φύσει ὃν ἐκ τούτων ἀγαγιούσε (Haer. xxx. 6). The correct reading φύσει ὃν is kept only in the Codex Marciianus (V), which is 247 years older than any other known MS. of Epiphanius, and has been thoroughly collated by Dindorf. All editions before his give φύτον, ‘the Hebrew PLANT according to Matthew,’ where ‘plant’ was supposed to mean genealogical ‘tree’ or ‘stem’—a sense however of which no other example was known in the entire range of Greek literature.

guage of Epiphanius's Ebionite Gospel according to the Hebrews.

In two passages which will be hereafter quoted, Epiphanius seems to treat two readings of the Ebionite Gospel as if they were corruptions of a Greek text. This may be explained by supposing either that Epiphanius forgot himself to be quoting from an Aramaic text, and not a Greek one, or that the Ebionites used a Greek translation side by side with the Aramaic.

Hilgenfeld and Prof. Westcott however overlook, or at least disregard these possibilities, and rush to the conclusion that the Ebionite Gospel was simply a Greek one. Hilgenfeld, in addition, brings forward two very curious arguments in favour of this view.

The first I translate in full: 'For he [Epiphanius] has indeed called their Gospel "according to Matthew" and "according to the Hebrews," but he has not reported that it was written in Hebrew. And so, beside that more ancient and Hebrew (or Aramaic) Gospel of Matthew, he has borne witness also to a Greek Gospel called "according to Matthew" and "according to the Hebrews," though of later age. Hegesippus seems already to have mentioned a Greek version of the Gospel of the Hebrews; for Eusebius has reported that he adduced some things "from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* and the *Syriac*," i.e. from the same Gospel in Greek and Syriac (or Aramaic).'[†]

Nothing can be weaker than this mode of inference. To be consistent, Hilgenfeld should have applied his argument from the silence of Epiphanius to the Nazarene Gospel. Epiphanius has told us that the Ebionite Gospel was called

† horum enim evangelium appellavit quidem κατὰ Ματθαῖον et καθ' Ἐβραιοὺς, sed hebraice scriptum esse non tradidit. itaque praeter illud antiquius et hebraicum (vel aramaeum) Matthaei evangelium Epiphanius etiam graecum evangelium dictum secundum Matthaeum et secundum Hebraeos, senioris quidem aetatis, testatus est. grece versum Hebraeorum evangelium iam Hegesippus indigitasse videtur, quem ἐκ τε τοῦ καθ' Ἐβραιοὺς εὐαγγελίου καὶ τοῦ Συριακοῦ, i.e. ex eodem evangelio, græco et syriaco (vel aramaeo), nonnulla protulisse Eusebius tradidit.—*N. T. extra Can. Recept.* iv. 7.

‘according to the Hebrews’; he has not told us that the Nazarene Gospel was so called: therefor he ‘has borne witness’ that it was not! Fortunately we have the plain witness of Jerome that it *was*.

The deduction from Eusebius must fare equally ill. It involves three assumptions—(i.) that ‘the Syriac’ means ‘the Syriac Gospel’; (ii.) that, although both the Ebionite and the Nazarene Gospels were called ‘according to the Hebrews,’ Eusebius limited the name to the former, which, being (according to Hilgenfeld) in Greek, had the less right to it; (iii.) that, besides this Greek ‘Gospel according to the Hebrews’ mentioned in three other places by Eusebius, he speaks twice of a separate Aramaic Gospel (Hilgenfeld’s ‘Syriac’) which he describes as ‘the Gospel existing among the Jews in the Hebrew language,’ and ‘the Gospel which is come to us in Hebrew characters,’ neither taking the trouble to tell his readers by what name this other Gospel was known, nor to give them the explanation needed to prevent them from confounding the two!

We shall hear by and by from Jerome that the Ebionites used the same Aramaic Gospel as the Nazarenes. But, even if we were able to explain away his definite statement, the inference from Epiphanius would be that the Ebionite Gospel was in Aramaic. He has said that the Nazarenes ‘have the Gospel according to Matthew, very full, in Hebrew. For assuredly this is still preserved among them, as it was first written, in Hebrew letters.’ He has gone straight from the Nazarenes to the Ebionites, whose founder, he says, had held the same opinions.* ‘And these too,’ he has written, ‘receive the Gospel according to Matthew. . . . And they call it “according to the Hebrews,” to tell the truth because Matthew alone in the New Covenant set both the exposition and preaching of the Gospel in Hebrew speech and Hebrew characters.’ He has gone on to tell of a man who read the Gospel according to Matthew, ‘an original Hebrew work,’ and has then reverted to the Ebionites. He does not in so many words say that the Ebionite Gospel was in ‘Hebrew,’ but surely no one would suspect from the tenor of his narrative that it was in Greek.

* Τὰ δημοια τούτοις φρονήσας (*Haer. xxx. 1*).

Let us go on to what else Epiphanius has to say about the Ebionite Gospel. A little further on he tells us that ‘in their Gospel according to Matthew as it is named, yet not entirely complete, but corrupted and docked—and they call it [the] Hebrew [Gospel]—it is contained that †’—and he proceeds to quote what was clearly the Preface to their Gospel, which the reader will find at the beginning of the Fragments.

At the end of it he goes on as follows, without the least break—† “And John began baptizing, and there came out unto him Pharisees and were baptized, and all Jerusalem. And John had raiment of camel’s hair and a leathern girdle about his loins, and his food [was] wild honey, whereof the taste was of the manna, like a cake [made] with oil”—that forsooth they may pervert the account of the truth into falsehood, and in place of “locusts” [*ἀκρίδων, akridón*] may put “cakes [*ἐγκρίδας, egkridás*] [made] with honey.”’ §

On this Hilgenfeld says ‘It is clear that the Gospel of the Ebionites was written at the first in Greek’; || Prof. Westcott (*Introduction*, 466, note 2) that ‘the variation shows that the Gospel was in Greek’; and Mr. Dodd (*Sayings ascribed to our Lord*, 78, note 38) that ‘they put *ἐγκρίδας* for *ἀκρίδας*.’

This view of the meaning of Epiphanius seems to me just doubtful. In the Greek text of Matthew the word is

† ’Εν τῷ γοῦν παρ’ αὐτοῖς Εὐαγγελίφ κατὰ Μαθαῖον ὄγομαζομένῳ, οὐχ δλφ δὲ πληρεστάτῳ, ἀλλὰ νενοθευμένῳ καὶ ἡκρωτηιασμένῳ—Ἐβραικὸν δὲ τοῦτο καλοῦσιν—ἐμφέρεται ὅτι κ.τ.λ. (*Haer. xxx.* 13).

‡ The Greek is given in a note to Fragment 5. Hilgenfeld reproves Dindorf for editing Καὶ ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης “‘And John began.’” He says that it should be καὶ ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης ‘and—“John began,”’ connecting ‘and’ with the words ‘it is contained that’ which introduce the Preface. But after so long an intervening quotation as the Preface a longer connecting link would have been used for clearness—such as ‘and then it says.’ We shall see moreover that this ‘and’ seems to have a connexion with Matt. iii. 1.

§ In the passage which he has just quoted he gives the word as ‘oil,’ not ‘honey.’ This variation is explained in a note to Fr. 5.

|| Ebionaeorum evangelium primitus graece scriptum esse apparent (36).

ἀκρίδες, *akrides* (nom. pl.), in the passage given by Epiphanius it is ἔγκρις, *egkris* (nom. sing.): the two are not so *very* much alike after all, and Epiphanius may merely have meant that one thing was substituted for another thing, and not one word for another word. Yet I confess to thinking that the latter interpretation is the more likely.

But, in a passage quoted in the note to Fr. 25, he accuses the Ebionites of having interpolated in a certain verse not only the word $\mu\eta$, but the two letters μ and η . Here at least his meaning is clear, and we must either believe that he was criticizing his own translated quotations as if they were the original, or else that the Ebionite Gospel according to the Hebrews existed in a Greek form.

I do not regard the former of these alternatives as altogether absurd,* but the latter is of course the more likely—especially as we know that the Ebionites put forward lengthy works in Greek two centuries before the time at which Epiphanius wrote.

Epiphanius goes on to say: ‘And the beginning of their Gospel has it that “It came to pass in the days of Herod the King of Judaea there came John baptizing a baptism of repentance in the Jordan river; who was said to be of the family of Aaron the priest, son of Zacharias and Elisabet. And all men came out to him.” And after much more it adds that “when the people had been baptized”’†—the rest of the quotation will be found under Fr. 7.

Epiphanius presently quotes the beginning of the Ebionite

* Let the voice of the encyclopaedias be heard. The *Enc. Britannica* says that Epiphanius ‘was utterly destitute of critical and logical power’; the *English Enc.* that ‘as a bitter controversialist, he often resorts to untrue arguments for the refutation of heretics’; and *Chambers’s Enc.* that his ‘want of honesty’ is ‘excessive.’

† Η δὲ ἀρχὴ τοῦ παρ’ αὐτοῖς Εὐαγγελίου ἔχει ὅτι ‘Ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἥλθεν Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων βάπτισμα μιτανοίας ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, ὃς ἐλέγετο εἶναι ἐκ γένους Ἀαρὼν τοῦ ἱερέως, παῖς Ζαχαρίου καὶ Ἐλισάβετ’ καὶ ἐξήρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντες.’ Καὶ μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν πολλὰ ἐπιφέρει ὅτι ‘Τοῦ λαοῦ βαπτισθέντος’ κ.τ.λ. (*Haer. xxx. 13*).

Gospel again with some variations: “ It came to pass in the days of Herod King of Judaea, Caiaphas being high priest, there came one John by name, baptizing a baptism in the river Jordan,” and so on.’ ‡

As Prof. Westcott says, ‘ a comparison of the two quotations illustrates the carelessness of Epiphanius’ (*Introduction*, 466). Anyone must see moreover that, if there were only one Ebionite version of the Gospel according to the Hebrews and the above were the beginning of it, no room is left for the passage before quoted by Epiphanius ‘ and John began baptizing &c.’

It is clear that different copies of the Ebionite Gospel had different beginnings; but it by no means follows that there were different versions of the body of it.

It is indeed easy to give an explanation of these different beginnings. Those of the Nazaraeo-Ebionite body who denied to Jesus a Divine birth, and rejected the first two chapters of Matthew, found themselves left with a narrative answering to Matt. iii. 1, ‘ And § in those days.’ This had to be altered, because ‘ those days’ would have no antecedent. Accordingly, some omitted them altogether—their copies commenced || ‘ And John began baptizing,’ the conjunction being retained, apparently, as a link between the ¶ Preface and the Gospel proper. Others altered ‘ those days’ into ‘ the days of Herod the King of Judaea,’ wrongly imagining the days in question to be those of Herod and Archelaus (Matt. ii. 22), instead of those of the dwelling at Nazareth (Matt. ii. 23): at the same time, in order to give a more important form to the beginning of the docked Gospel, some added a further specification of time, ‘ Caiaphas being high priest,’ some a fuller notice of John—‘ who was said to be of the family of Aaron the priest, the son of Zacharias and Elisabet.’

‡ ‘ Εγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Καιάφα, ἥλθε τις Ἰωάννης ὁνόματι, βαπτίζων βάπτισμα μετανοίας ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ Ἰορδάνῃ,’ καὶ τὰ ἔξης (*Haer. xxx. 14*).

§ The received text omits ‘ and,’ but the best editors insert it.

¶ See above, p. 13.

|| See above, p. 13.

We have yet to consider a statement of Epiphanius with regard to *TATIAN: ‘And the “Gospel through Four” is said to have been made by him, which some call “according to the Hebrews.”’ †

That Tatian can have written the Gospel according to the Hebrews is out of the question. Irenaeus, who mentions Tatian and his doctrines, and was his younger contemporary, is not likely to have been led to believe that the Ebionite Gospel was the Gospel according to Matthew when it was really a compilation made out of four Gospels by Tatian. Nor is it likely that Clement of Alexandria, who quotes Tatian, would have cited one of his works as Scripture, not knowing that it was from the pen of a late heresiarch. But the fact that Hegesippus, a Jewish Christian himself, who lived ‡ ‘in the first succession to the Apostles,’ and died not

* Tatian was a pupil of Justin Martyr, whose death is placed variously between 148 and 167 A.D., the former being the date assigned by the latest investigator, Prof. Hort. After Justin’s death, but how long we do not know, he went to Syria, where he became a sectarian leader.

† Λέγεται δὲ τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων Εὐαγγέλιον ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ γεγενῆσθαι, ὅπερ καὶ Ἐβραίους τιὲς καλοῦσι (*Haer.* xlvi. 1). The printed text reads Εὐαγγελίων. On first turning to it (from Hilgenfeld’s mere reference) I at once saw that we ought to read Εὐαγγέλιον, and I since find that Prof. Westcott (*Canon*, 290 n.) says, ‘Some perhaps may be inclined to change εὐαγγελίων into εὐαγγέλιον,’ and that the author of *Supernatural Religion*, and Dr. Sanday (from Credner) so read without remark. Cf. Theodoret, *Haer. Fab.* i. 20, ‘He also put together the so-called “Gospel through Four”—Οὗτος καὶ τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων καλούμενον συντέθεικεν Εὐαγγέλιον. There can be no doubt that the full title of the work called in short τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων was τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων Εὐαγγέλιον, ‘the Gospel through Four,’ i.e. the Gospel as published through the mouths of Four (cf. the common phrase in Matthew τὸ ὅρθεν ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφητοῦ, ‘that which was spoken by the Lord THROUGH the prophet’). I know of no other explanation of the title ‘Dia-tessaron’ at once grammatical and rational. Prof. Westcott (*Canon*, 290 n.) says ‘The term διὰ τεσσάρων was used in music to express the concord of the fourth (συλλαβή). This sense may throw some light upon the name.’ But a concord of the fourth is not a concord of four notes, but only of two.

‡ See above, p. 7.

later than 192 A.D. and possibly as early as 180 A.D., § ‘adduced some things’ from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, is of itself proof enough that this cannot have been written by Tatian.

The learning of JEROME, his long residence in Syria and Palestine, and the fact that he first copied the Gospel according to the Hebrews and afterwards translated it into two languages, render his evidence of paramount importance. I shall take his notices of the Gospel in order of time.||

(1) Writing in 387 A.D. upon Ephes. v. 3, he says ¶ ‘As also in the Hebrew Gospel we read of the Lord speaking to his disciples : saith he &c.’

(2) Writing before 392 A.D. upon Mic. vii. 6, he says ** “*And the daughter-in-law riseth up against her mother-in-law.*” Which seems difficult to be understood metaphorically. But he who has read the *Song of Songs* and has understood the spouse of the soul to be the Word of God, and has believed the Gospel published according to the Hebrews which we have lately translated, in which it is said in the person of the Saviour, “*Just now my mother, the Holy Spirit, took me by one of my hairs,*” will not hesitate to say that the Word of God is sprung from the Spirit, and that the soul, which is the spouse of the Word, has for mother-in-law the Holy Spirit, who among the Hebrews is called in the feminine gender *Rua.*”

§ See above, p. 6.

|| I have followed Clinton’s chronology of these writings of Jerome.

¶ Ut in Hebraico quoque Evangelio legimus Dominum ad discipulos loquentem : *Et nunquam, inquit, laeti sitis, nisi quum fratrem vestrum videritis in caritate* (*Comm. in Ephes. lib. iii.*).

** *Et nurus consurgit adversus soicum suam.* Quod iuxta tropologiam intellectu videtur difficile. Sed qui legerit *Canticum Cantorum* et sponsum animae Dei Sermonem intellexerit, credideritque Evangelio quod secundum Hebraeos editum nuper transtulimus, in quo ex persona Salvatoris dicitur *Modo tulit me mater mea, Sanctus Spiritus, in uno capillorum meorum, non dubitat dicere Sermonem Dei ortum esse de Spiritu, et animam, quae sponsa Sermonis est, habere soerum Sanctum Spiritum; qui apud Hebraeos genere dicitur feminino Rua* (*Comm. in Mich. lib. ii.*).

It is pretty clear that Jerome thinks people *ought* to believe the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

(3) Writing his account of Matthew (*Catal. Script. Eccl.*) in 392, he says * ‘Matthew, who is also Levi, and who from a tax-gatherer came to be an Apostle, first of all the Evangelists composed a Gospel of Christ in Judaea in the Hebrew language and characters, for the benefit of those of the circumcision who had believed: who translated it into Greek is not sufficiently ascertained. Furthermore, the Hebrew itself is preserved to this day in the library at Caesarea which the martyr Pamphilus so diligently collected. † I also was allowed by the Nazarenes who use this volume in the Syrian city of Beroea to copy it. ‡ In which it is to be remarked that, wherever the Evangelist, either speaking in his own person or in that of our Lord and Saviour, makes use of the testimonies of the old Scripture, he does not follow the authority of the Seventy translators, but that of the Hebrew; of which testimonies are those two, *Out of Egypt have I called my Son, and that he shall be called Nazarene.*’

And in his account of James he speaks of it as § ‘the Gospel which is called “according to the Hebrews,” and was

* Matthaeus, qui et Levi, ex publicano Apostolus, primus in Judaea propter eos qui ex circumcisione crediderant Evangelium Christi Hebraicis litteris verbisque composuit: quod quis postea in Graecum transtulerit non satis certum est. Porro ipsum Hebraicum habetur usque hodie in Caesariensi bibliotheca quam Pamphilus martyr studiosissime confecit. Mihi quoque a Nazaraeis qui in Beroea urbe Syriae hoc volumine utuntur describendi facultas fuit. In quo animadvertisendum quod, ubiquumque Evangelista, sive ex persona sua, sive ex persona Domini Salvatoris, veteris Scripturae testimoniis abutitur, non sequatur Septuaginta translatorum auctoritatem sed Hebraicam; e quibus illa duo sunt, *Ex Aegypto vocavi filium meum et Quoniam Nazaraeus vocabitur.*

† Probably before 379 A.D., after which date he is not known to have been in the neighbourhood of Beroea.

‡ In notes to Fr. 2 and Fr. 3 the question whether the rest of the passage refers to the Nazarene Gospel in particular, or to the Gospel of Matthew at large, is fully discussed.

§ Evangelium quoque quod appellatur ‘secundum Hebraeos’ et a me nuper in Graecum Latinumque sermonem translatum est, quo et Origenes saepe utitur.

lately translated by me into the Greek language and the Latin, which also Origen often uses.'

The statement that Origen frequently quotes the Gospel according to the Hebrews is most important. It is quoted by name once only in his Greek text, and once also in a Latin translation of his *Homilies on Matthew*. Jerome, however, who was a devoted student of Origen and had translated his commentaries on the Song of Songs, on Jeremiah, on Ezekiel, and on Luke, can scarcely be mistaken. There is no need to suppose that Origen's quotations from the Gospel were in || books now lost, for his extant works contain several sayings attributed by him to Jesus of which the source is unknown: these will be given among the 'Probable and Possible Fragments' (*Appendix H*).

(4) Writing his *Commentaries on Matthew* in 398 A.D., he compares five passages in the Gospel according to the Hebrews with corresponding passages in the Greek Matthew. In these instances he speaks of it (i.) as ¶ 'the actual Hebrew,' *Matt.* ii. 5; (ii.) as ** 'the Gospel which is called "according

|| It is, however, worth noting that all of Origen's *Homilies on Matthew* previous to c. xiii. 6 is lost. The missing portion may well have contained references to the Gospel according to the Hebrews: as has been said, the Latin translation of the extant part of the Greek text actually does give one quotation from it, though whether the translator found that in his MS. or interpolated it himself is unknown.

¶ *Bethleem Iudeae . . . Librariorum hic error est. Putamus enim ab Evangelista primum editum, sicut in ipso Hebraico legimus, Iudee—non Iudeae.—‘Bethleem of Judaea . . . Here is a mistake of the copyists. For we think that the Evangelist originally gave, as we read in the actual Hebrew, of Juda—not of Judaea.’ I am most anxious not to impress doubtful evidence; but to me this passage seems most strongly to point to the Hebrew original of Matthew and not merely the Hebrew of the Old Testament. So Prof. Westcott and the author of *Supernatural Religion*, with De Wette (doubtlessly), Schwegler, and Ewald; against Delitzsch, Credner, Hilgenfeld, and Dr. Sanday.. In the notes on Fr. 2 and Fr. 3 I have fully discussed the question whether Matt. i. 18–ii. 23 were present in or absent from Jerome's copy of the Gospel according to the Hebrews.*

** In Evangelio quod appellatur ‘secundum Hebreos.’

to the Hebrews,"' *Matt.* vi. 11; (iii.) as * 'the Gospel which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use, which we lately translated from the Hebrew language into Greek, and which is called by very many [*or most*, 'plerisque'] the original of Matthew,' *Matt.* xii. 13; † 'the Gospel which the Nazarenes use,' *Matt.* xxiii. 35; ‡ 'the Gospel which is written according to the Hebrews,' *Matt.* xxvii. 16; § 'the Gospel of which we often make mention,' *Matt.* xxvii. 51.

The third of the above references is important as showing, first, that the Nazarenes and Ebionites used the same Aramaic Gospel; secondly, that the popular opinion of this Gospel was that it was the original of Matthew.

(5) Writing to Hedybia, at some date after 398 A.D., Jerome speaks of || 'the Gospel which is written in Hebrew letters,' referring to it for a variation on the narrative of the Crucifixion.

(6) Writing about 410 A.D. upon Is. xi. 2, he calls it ¶ 'the Gospel, written in the Hebrew language, which the Nazarenes read.' He quotes from it the account of the descent of the Spirit and the voice from heaven at the

* In Evangelio quo utuntur Nazarei et Ebionitae, quod nuper in Graecum de Hebraeo sermone transtulimus, et quod vocatur a plerisque Matthaei authenticum.

† In Evangelio quo utuntur Nazareni.

‡ In Evangelio quod scribitur iuxta Hebraeos.

§ In Evangelio cuius saepe facimus mentionem.

|| In Evangelio autem quod Hebraicis litteris scriptum est (*Ep. ad Hedyb.* viii.).

¶ Super hunc igitur florem, qui de trunko et de radice Iesse per Mariam Virginem repente consurget, requiescat Spiritus Domini, quia in ipso complacuit omnem plenitudinem divinitatis habitare corporaliter—nequaquam per partes, ut in ceteris sanctis, sed, iuxta Evangelium quod Hebraeo sermone conscriptum legunt Nazarei 'Descendet super eum omnis fons Spiritus Sancti' (*Comm. in Is. lib. iv.*)—'Upon this flower therefor, which shall suddenly arise from the trunk and from the root of Jesse through the Virgin Mary, the Spirit of the Lord shall rest, because it hath pleased him that in him the entire fulness of the Godhead should dwell bodily—in no wise partially, as in the rest of the saints, but, according to the Gospel, composed in the Hebrew language, which the Nazarenes read, "The entire fountain of the Holy Spirit shall descend upon him."'

baptism of Jesus, in illustration and confirmation of the prophecy before him.

(7) Writing in 413 A.D. on Ezek. xviii. 7, he calls it ** ‘*the Gospel according to the Hebrews* which the Nazarenes are wont to read,’ and refers to it, immediately after the ‘Apostolic authority’ of Paul, as confirming the moral injunction of Ezekiel.

(8) Writing in 416 A.D. against the Pelagians, he says †† ‘In the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, which is written indeed in the Chaldee and Syriac language, but in Hebrew letters; which the Nazarenes use to this day—according to the Apostles, or, as very many [or most, ‘*plerique*’] deem, according to Matthew—which is also contained in the library at Caesarea—the history tells &c.’

If the reader will turn to Fr. 1, the Preface to Ebionite copies of this Gospel, he will see that it implies that the Gospel was written either by the Apostles generally or by Matthew—but does not clearly state which. We can understand, therefor, how some people, though seemingly not most, fancied it to be the product of common Apostolic authorship.††

After the above passage, Jerome quotes Fr. 6 and Fr. 9,

** *Quod autem iuxta Hebraicum dicitur, Et hominem non contristaverit, Apostolico congruit testimonio, Nolite contristare Spiritum Sanctum qui habitat in vobis.* Et in Evangelio quod iuxta Hebreos Nazarei legere consueverunt inter maxima ponitur crimina, qui fratris sui spiritum contristaverit (*Comm. in Ezech. lib. vi.*)—‘But the reading of the Hebrew text, *And hath not grieved a man*, agrees with the witness of the Apostle, *Grieve not the Holy Spirit that dwelleth in you. And in the Gospel according to the Hebrews*, which the Nazarenes are wont to read, he who hath grieved the spirit of his brother is put among the greatest criminals.’

†† In *Evangelio iuxta Hebreos*, quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone sed Hebraicis litteris scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni—secundum Apostolos, sive, ut plerique autumant, iuxta Matthaeum—quod et in Caesariensi habetur bibliotheca—narrat historia &c. (*Dial. adv. Pelag. lib. iii.*).

†† On the theory set up from this passage that Justin’s ‘Memoirs of the Apostles’ were nothing more nor less than the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, see *Appendix E*, ‘Justin’s “Memoirs of the Apostles.”’

adding a statement from Ignatius to the effect that the Apostles when chosen were sinners above all men. He then says, * ‘If thou usest not these testimonies for authority, use them at least for antiquity, as to what all churchmen have felt.’ The contents of the Fragments in question are so bold that, unless Jerome had had a very firm faith in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, it is most unlikely that he would have not only adopted them but stamped them with his approbation in a controversial work.

We now pass to two of Jerome’s contemporaries and adversaries—Julian the Pelagian, and Theodore of Mopsuestia, who both mention him in connexion with the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

JULIAN the Pelagian in his controversy with Augustine† uses the last-mentioned passage of Jerome against Augustine, saying that Jerome ‘even tries by the testimony of a (or the) fifth Gospel, which he says has been translated by himself, to show &c.’ ‡

THEODORE § of Mopsuestia is reported by PHOTIUS to have said that Jerome ‘had forged an additional fifth Gospel, pretending that he had found it in the bookcases of Eusebius of Palestine.’ ||

These passages of course only show that their authors knew nothing whatever about the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

Next comes THEODORET, ¶ who states first of the Ebionites

* Quibus testimoniis si non uteris ad auctoritatem, utere saltem ad antiquitatem, quid omnes ecclesiastici viri senserint.

† Not later than 430 A.D., when Augustine died.

‡ Cum ille in Dialogo illo . . . etiam quinti Evangelii, quod a se translatum dicit, testimonio nitatur ostendere &c. (Augustini *Opus Imperfectum contra Iulianum*, lib. iv. c. 88.) I owe this reference to Prof. Westcott.

§ Born about 350 A.D., died 428 or 429 A.D.

|| Τοῦτον (i.e. Jerome) δὲ πέμπτον Εὐαγγελιον προσαναπλάσας λέγει (i.e. Theodore), ἐν ταῖς Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Παλαιστίνου βιβλιοθήκαις ὑποπλαττόμενον εὑρεῖν (Bibl. clxxvii.). Photius died about 891 A.D.

¶ Writing between 451 and 458 A.D.

in general that ‘they receive only the Gospel according to the Ebionites,’^{**} and afterwards, speaking of particular Ebionites, that ‘they use only *the Gospel according to Matthew*.’^{††}

BÆDA,^{‡‡} at the beginning of the eighth century, does not seem to have known any more of this Gospel than what he learnt from Jerome. After speaking of Apocryphal Gospels, he says ‘Here it must be noted that *the Gospel according to the Hebrews*, as it is called, is not to be reckoned among apocryphal but among ecclesiastical histories: for it seemed good even to the very translator of Holy Scripture, Jerome, to use very many evidences from it, and to translate it into the Latin and Greek language.’^{§§} The words *ecclesiastical* and *histories* are doubtless borrowed from our last passage of Jerome.

At the end of the eighth, or beginning of the ninth, century NIKEPHORUS^{|||} puts the Gospel according to the Hebrews in his list of the disputed books of the New Testament—together with the Apocalypse of John, the (lost) Apocalypse of Peter, and the Epistle of Barnabas. He has a separate list of *apocryphal* books. Credner, who has given much pains to these lists, argues, not without reason, that they are derived from some very much earlier Syriac authority, of about the fifth century (*Geschichte des Kanons*, 1847, pp. 100 seqq.).

About the same time SEDULIUS SCOTUS^{¶¶} refers to the oath

^{**} Μόνον δὲ τὸ κατὰ Ἐβιωναῖον Εὐαγγέλιον δέχονται (*Haer. Fab.* ii. 1).

^{††} Εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ τῷ κατὰ Ματθαῖον κέχρηνται μόνῳ (*ib.*).

^{‡‡} Born about 672 A.D., died 735 A.D.

^{§§} Inter quae notandum quod dicitur *Evangelium iuxta Hebraeos* non inter apocryphas sed inter ecclesiasticas numerandum historias: nam et ipsi Sacrae Scripturae interpreti Hieronymo pleraque ex eo testimonia usurpare, et ipsum in Latinum Graecumque visum est transferre sermonem (*In Luc. I. i.*).

^{|||} Patriarch of Constantinople, born about 758 A.D., died 828 A.D.

^{¶¶} Flourished about 800 A.D.

of James (Fr. 29) with the words ‘according as it is read in the Gospel according to the Hebrews.’* As the incident is related by Jerome, and Sedulius also wrote Explanations of Jerome’s Prefaces to the Gospels, there is little doubt that this reference is only borrowed from him.

Finally, CODEX TISCHENDORFIANUS III. (Λ), a Greek MS. of the Gospels, dating from about the beginning of the ninth century, contains in Matthew four marginal quotations of corresponding passages in ‘the Jewish ($\tauὸ\;Ιουδαϊκὸν$)’, one of which is identical with one of Jerome’s quotations from the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

We have seen that in one passage Jerome speaks of ‘*the Gospel according to the Hebrews* which the Nazarenes use to this day—after the Apostles, or, as † most deem, according to Matthew.’ Accordingly Hilgenfeld, the writer of *Supernatural Religion*, and others identify it with the Gospel according to the Twelve Apostles spoken of by Origen, Ambrose, Jerome himself, and Theophylact. If this be so, it tends to show that not one of these four believed in the Matthaean origin of the Gospel according to the Hebrews. ORIGEN says ‘The Church has four Gospels, the heresies very many, out of which a certain one is written according to the Egyptians, another according to the Twelve Apostles &c. &c.’‡ AMBROSE, writing before 400 A.D., says ‘And there is current indeed another Gospel which the Twelve Apostles are said to have written.’§ JEROME himself, writ-

* Sicut in Evangelio secundum Hebraeos legitur (*In 1 Cor. xv. 7*).

† In Evangelio iuxta Hebraeos quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni—secundum Apostolos, sive, ut plerique autumant, iuxta Matthaeum (*Adv. Pelag. iii. 2*). *Plerique* may mean only ‘very many.’

‡ Ecclesia quatuor habet Evangelia, haereses plurima, e quibus quoddam scribitur secundum Aegyptios, aliud juxta Duodecim Apostolos &c. &c. (*Hom. i. in Luc.*—extant in the Latin translation only).

§ Et alind quidem fertur Evangelium quod Duodecim Apostolos scripsisse dicuntur (*Comm. in Luc.—prooem.*).

ing 398 A.D., says that many of the Gospels spoken of by Luke remain, 'which, published by diverse authors, have been the starting-points of diverse heresies; as is that according to the Egyptians, and Thomas, and Matthias, of the Twelve Apostles also &c.'|| Lastly, THEOPHYLACT, writing at the beginning of the seventh century, speaks of the Gospel inscribed 'of the Twelve.'¶

This identification I cannot accept. Jerome does not state that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was *called* 'after (according to) the Apostles,' he is only giving different views as to its origin, and he expressly states that a common opinion attributed it to Matthew. If anyone should fancy that '*secundum Apostolos*,' as compared with '*iuxta Hebraeos*' and '*iuxta Matthaeum*,' implies that the title is being given, he will find that Jerome elsewhere (*Comm. on Micah* vii. 6 and *Matt.* vi. 11) calls it also '*secundum Hebraeos*,' the object of *secundum* in the passage before us being therefor only to prevent the awkwardness of three *iuxta*'s so close together. Wher-ever (four times) he expressly gives the name of the Gospel it is 'according to the Hebrews' (*Comm. on Micah* vii. 6, *Matt.* vi. 11 and xxvii. 16, *Catal. Script. Eccl.* under 'Iacobus'). That he would speak of the 'Gospel of the Twelve Apostles' in the preface to his commentary on Matthew, and twice in that Commentary say that this same Gospel was 'called' 'according to the Hebrews,' is most unlikely. Nor is it less unlikely that he would twice in that Commentary (on *Matt.* ii. 5 and xii. 13) uphold the Matthaean origin of the Gospel according to the Hebrews and yet in the preface to the same Commentary mention it as one of a number of Gospels 'which, having been published by diverse authors, have been the starting-points of diverse heresies.'

Of the remaining three authors, neither Ambrose nor Theophylact, nor yet Origen, says a word to lead us to identify the two Gospels; Origen indeed once, if not twice, quotes the Gospel according to the Hebrews by its usual name. From the time of Irenaeus, who lived before Origen,

|| Quae a diversis auctoribus edita diversarum haereseon fuere principia; ut est illud iuxta Aegyptios, et Thomam, et Matthiam, Duodecim quoque Apostolorum, &c. (*Comm. in Matth.—prooem.*).

¶ Τὸ ἐπιγραφομένων τῶν Δώδεκα (*In Luc.—prooem.*).

to that of Jerome, who outlived Ambrose, the authorship of the Gospel according to the Hebrews seems to have been generally assigned to Matthew, and from the time of Clement, Origen's master, to Nikephorus, who lived 200 years after Theophylact, its popular title seems to have been 'the Gospel according to the Hebrews.' It is therefor most unlikely that this should be the work of which, without any further explanation, Origen, Ambrose, and Theophylact speak as the Gospel according to the Twelve Apostles.

We may now sum up the external evidence regarding this Gospel. We find that there existed among the Nazarenes and Ebionites a Gospel commonly called the 'Gospel according to the Hebrews,' written in Aramaic, but with Hebrew characters. That its authorship was attributed by some to the Apostles in general, but by very many or most—including clearly the Nazarenes and Ebionites themselves—to Matthew. That it is spoken of as the Gospel according to Matthew by Irenaeus about 190 A.D., and by Epiphanius and its translator Jerome in the fourth century, though Epiphanius mentions that the Ebionite copies were corrupted. That Papias narrated a story found in it, if he did not quote it; that Hegesippus quoted it; that it was cited as Scripture by Clement of Alexandria; and was quoted by Origen—all of whom wrote before the middle of the third century. That some people were counting it spurious in the middle of the fourth century, but that we do not know who they were or whether their opinion was merely the result of prejudice against a work circulating almost exclusively amongst sectarians. That at the same time the Apocalypse of John was also counted spurious by some. That in a list of about 800 A.D., but derived, maybe, from one of about the fifth century, the Gospel according to the Hebrews is called a disputed book, but is not called spurious—the Apocalypse of John being again classed with it.

It must be said that this Gospel is not found in any list of accepted books: the omission would, however, be natural if it was looked on as a mere Aramaic edition of the Gospel according to Matthew. On the other hand, neither is it found in any list of disputed books, save those of Eusebius

and Nikephorus above-mentioned.* Nor were its popular claims to be looked on as an authentic Gospel coming from Matthew challenged by a single ancient writer except Theodore of Mopsuestia, who accused Jerome of 'having forged an additional fifth Gospel, pretending that he had found it in the bookcases of Eusebius of Palestine'—a statement which of course shows that he knew nothing whatever of the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

I shall now give an annotated rendering of the Fragments, after which, in Part III., I shall estimate the internal evidence afforded by them, and shall consider whether the external and internal evidence combine to render likely any conclusion about the origin of this Gospel.

* See, however, *Addenda*.

II.

THE FRAGMENTS.

NOTE.—I have arranged those Fragments which have canonical parallels so as to correspond with the order of the Gospel according to Matthew, inserting others at those points where they might be most easily dovetailed into the canonical narrative. I have broken them up into verses for more convenient comparison with the canonical texts. In translating, my aim has been to be as literal as possible, short of being grossly unidiomatical*: otherwise the translation would have been much closer than it is to the phraseology of the Authorized Version.

Fragments from Epiphanius are indicated by (*Ebionite*), those from Jerome by (*Nazarene*), those from Codex Tischendorfianus III.—presumably taken from Jerome's translation—by (*Nazarene?*). A quotation of Origen's which seems to have been common to the Gospel according to Matthew and that of the 'Ebionites,' is not indicated as (*Ebionite*) because in writers before Epiphanius 'Ebionites' seems to include the Nazarenes, whom he is the first to mention under the latter name.

**FRAGMENTS OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE
HEBREWS.**

† 1. Preface.
(*Ebionite*)

1. There was a certain man by name

* In two passages I have however kept 'Lord' as the translation of Κύριε, where I should have liked 'Master' or 'Sir,' in order not to weaken the parallelism between those passages and others in the canonical books.

† Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. 13: (1) Ἐγένετό τις ἀνὴρ ὄνοματι Ἰησοῦς, καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, δὲ ἔξελέξατο ἡμᾶς. (2) Καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς Καφαρναοῦμ ἐσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος Πέτρου, καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ εἶπε (3) Παρερχόμενος παρὰ τῇ λίμνῃ Τιβεριάδος ἔξελέξαμην Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον, νιοὺς Ζεβεδαίου,

Jesus, and he of † about thirty years, who chose us out.

2. And when he had come to § Capharnaum he || entered into the house of Simon who was surnamed Peter, and opened his mouth, and said

3. ‘Passing by the ¶ lake of Tiberias I chose out ** John and James, sons of Zebedee,

καὶ Σίμωνα, καὶ Ἀνδρέαν καὶ Θαδδαῖον καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν Ζηλωτὴν καὶ Ἰούδαν τὸν Ἰσκαριώτην’ (4) καὶ σὲ τὸν Μαθαῖον καθεζόμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ τελωνίου ἔκάλεσα καὶ ἡκολούθησάς μοι, (5) ‘Ὑμᾶς οὖν βούλομαι εἶναι δεκαδύνα μποστόλους εἰς μαρτύριον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

‡ Cf. Luke iii. 23. Hilgenfeld reads ὡν for ὡς, ‘being of thirty years,’ but gives no authority for doing so, and I believe it to be his own ill-advised conjecture: compare the ὥστε of Luke, *for which Epiphanius actually read ὡς*, as do D and Hippolytus.

§ This (=Caphar Nahum, ‘Nahum’s village’) is the form of the name adopted in the New Testament by modern editors: of the earliest MSS. ¶ B D (and now and then C) support it against A and (generally) C.

|| According to Mark iii. 19 Jesus and the Apostles went into a house immediately after the appointment of the Twelve. From Matt. viii. 14, Mark i. 29, and Luke iv. 38 we learn that Simon had a house at Capharnahum.

¶ Called ‘the sea of Tiberias’ in John xxi. 1 and ‘the sea of Galilee of Tiberias’ in John vi. 1. Matthew calls it ‘the sea of Galilee,’ iv. 18, xv. 29; Mark the same, i. 16, vii. 31; Luke ‘the lake of Gennesaret,’ v. 1. Luke always calls it ‘the lake,’ the others always ‘the sea.’ John, James, Simon, and Andrew were called on the shores of the lake (see Matt. iv. 18–24, Mark i. 16–20, Luke v. 10, 11). As there is a gap after the name of Andrew we do not know whether the Ebionite Gospel assigned the calling of all the other Apostles to the same neighbourhood, but Epiphanius’s omission is best accounted for by supposing that he had before him a mere row of names with connecting particles, unbroken by any new turn of the narrative.

** This order is very remarkable. There are four lists of Apostles in the New Testament—Matt. x. 2, Mark iii. 16, Luke vi. 14, Acts i. 13. Matthew gives the order of the first four Apostles as *Simon, Andrew, James, and John*. Luke in his Gospel gives the same order, but in Acts alters it to *Simon, John, James, and Andrew*. Mark has *Simon, James, John, and Andrew*. I am unable to suggest any

and Simon, and Andrew,* . . . and †Thaddeus, and Simon the ‡ Zealot, and Judas § the Iscariot;

4. ‘And thee || Matthew sitting at the receipt of custom I called, and thou didst follow me.

5. ‘I will, therefor, that ye be twelve apostles for a testimony to Israel.’

reason why Simon should be put only third in the Ebionite Gospel unless it be that, the Apostles linked by the tie of brotherhood being mentioned by pairs, John and James were considered a more important pair than Simon and Andrew.

* An example of the carelessness of Epiphanius, who has only given us eight names, though the mention of ‘twelve Apostles’ in v. 5 shows that the names of four others were in the original.

† The name *Thaddaios*, ‘Thaddeus,’ occurs in Mark iii. 18, where however D and the Old Latin read *Lebbaios*, ‘Lebbaeus,’ which name (or *Lebes* or *Levis*) was also the reading of MSS. spoken of by Origen. In Matt. x. 3, *Thaddaios* is also read by B, by some MSS. of the old Latin, by the Vulgate, and by the Coptic versions: most MSS. also (C¹ is uncertain) read ‘Lebbaeus that was surnamed Thaddeus,’ and so the Syriac versions (the Curetonian is deficient here) with the Aethiopic and Armenian; but D, with MSS. spoken of by Augustine, reads ‘Lebbaeus’ alone, and this was the reading of Origen’s translator (of Rufinus, about A.D. 400) and Hesychius (6th cent.).

‡ ‘The Cananaean’ as he is called by Matt. and Mark (not ‘Canaanite,’ as the A. V.). ‘Cananaean’ (from *Kanean*) was the Aramaic name for that ultra-patriotic faction of Jews whom Josephus, writing in Greek, calls the *Zealots*. We find Luke (vi. 15 and Acts i. 13) using the Greek equivalent.

§ Τὸν Ἰσκαριώτην, as the weight of MS. authority in Matt. x. 4, John xii. 4, xiv. 22. Ἰσκαριώτης and Ἰσκαριώθ (*Iskarioth*)—the latter of which is now the recognised reading in Mark iii. 19, xiv. 10, and Luke vi. 16—are the Graecized forms of *Ish K’rioth*, ‘man of K’rioth,’ a town in the south of the tribe of Judah, possibly the ruins called *Kuryetein*.

|| Matthew may just possibly be mentioned last as having been called under different circumstances from the rest; otherwise the position of his name must be taken to imply that he was the writer of the Gospel, whether its sole author or its editor on behalf of the Apostles collectively.

¶ 2. Matt. ii. 5.

(*Nazarene.*)

Bethlehem of Judah.

** 3. Matt. ii. 15.

(*Nazarene.*)

Out of Egypt have I called my son.

¶ Jerome on Matt. ii. 5, Librarium hic error est. Putamus enim ab Evangelista primum editum, sicut in ipso Hebraico legimus *Iudea*, non *Iudeae*—‘Here is a mistake of the copyists. For we think that the Evangelist originally gave, as we read in the actual Hebrew, *of Judah*—not *of Judea*.’ Hilgenfeld and some others hold that the Hebrew of the Old Testament is referred to. Now (i.) Jerome, who believed in the Matthaean origin of that Gospel, and had published his belief, would hardly have couched a reference to the Hebrew of the Old Testament in words which, as he would have seen, might be naturally taken as a reference to his Aramaic Gospel; (ii.) it is remarkable that Jerome suggests not ‘Bethleem *Iuda*’ as the original reading, but ‘Bethleem *Iudea*,’ ‘*of Judah*.’ In every passage in the Old Testament where Bethlehem Judah is named, Jerome renders ‘Bethleem *Iuda*,’ and in the very verse of Matthew which he is commenting on he twice quotes the prophecy of Micah as ‘Et tu Bethleem terra *Iuda*.’ This solitary use of ‘*Iudea*’ struck me as singular, and on enquiring from the Rev. Dr. Hermann Adler, I learn that, whereas the Hebrew of the Old Testament always has ‘Bethleem *Yehudah*,’ the Aramaic (in which the Gospel according to the Hebrews was written) would probably represent the name as ‘Bethleem *di Yehudah*,’ ‘Bethleem *of Judah*,’ ‘Bethleem *Iudea*.’ Jerome’s reason for writing ‘*Iudea*’ in this solitary instance seems, therefor, to have been that he was speaking not of the *Hebrew* of the Old Testament but of the *Aramaic* Gospel according to the Hebrews. In Matth. ii. 1, 5, Cureton gives ‘*of Juda*’ as the reading of the Curetonian Syriac ‘with which the Peshito concurs.’ Tischendorf gives ‘*Iuda*’ (Bethleem *Iuda*) as the reading of both. But a few minutes with a Syriac grammar shows me that Cureton is right at least as regards his own version, which has the preposition *di* in front of *Yuda*. Some MSS. of the Old Latin and Vulgate also give *Iudea*, ‘*of Judah*.’

** Jerome, *Catal. Script. Eccles.* under ‘*Matthaeus*;’ the passage is quoted and translated above, p. 18. Hilgenfeld and others, who believe that the Gospel according to the Hebrews did not contain Matt. i. 18–ii. 23, deny that the passage in Jerome proves that this and the next quotation were found in his copy of the Nazarene Gospel. The question hardly admits of argument, and I am quite content to leave its decision to the reader. Those who have no previous acquaintance with Jerome’s writings may indeed wonder why he directs special attention to the fact that the O. T. quotations in the

* 4. Matt. ii. 23. That he shall be called Nazarene.
(Nazarene.)

Nazarene Gospel agree with the Hebrew, seeing that the two instances given occur in the canonical Matthew, where they agree equally with the Hebrew. Jerome, however, never loses an opportunity of arguing for the higher authority of the original Hebrew over the Septuagint version, and his object in the passage in question may very well be to show that not only the Greek translation of Matthew took its quotations from the Hebrew, but that so also did the original Aramaic. Hilgenfeld's 'elaborate review of the question,' as Dr. Sanday calls it (*Gospels*, 141), consists almost entirely of refutations to feeble arguments adduced by some of his opponents, whom he has no difficulty in vanquishing. But the only two which he brings forward on his own side afford them an equally easy victory. One is, that this part of Matthew was rejected by Kerinthus and Carpocrates, which would be a strong argument if we knew that these heresiarchs used the Nazarene edition of the Gospel according to the Hebrews: unhappily there is no evidence that they used any edition of it whatever (see *Appendix C*, 'The Gospel of Carpocrates and Kerinthus'). The other is that Epiphanius, when he confessed his ignorance 'whether the Nazarenes have at the same time taken away the genealogies from Abraham to Christ,' has assumed that the rest of Matt. i. ii. was wanting from their Gospel. I merely ask the reader to turn to the passage (quoted above, p. 9), and remark in conclusion that, if my last note is well founded, Hilgenfeld's position breaks down altogether.

* The Greek of Matt. ii. 23, rendered by Jerome in the same Latin by which he renders the parallel passage in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, needs not mean that there was any particular prophecy 'He shall be called Nazarene.' It is true that the Greek is 'that he *shall* be called' and not 'that he *should* be called,' but, if any Greek scholar thinks that the use of the indicative means that the actual words 'he shall be called' were found in the prophets, a reference to Madvig's *Syntax of the Greek Language*, Browne and Arnold's translation, 1873, p. 110, or to Winer's *Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Moulton's translation, 1877, p. 376, will yield him plain examples to the contrary.

The reference is to the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Zechariah respecting the BRANCH. In the most striking of these, Is. xi. 1, 'And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch out of his roots,' the Hebrew word used for 'branch' is NETSER, and the evangelic writer saw in this prophecy and those

+5. Matt. iii. 1-7.

1. And [†¹ in those days?] John began

of Jeremiah and Zechariah (though they use a different Hebrew word) a foreshadowing of the residence at NAZARA, or looked on the residence at Nazara as a predestined coincidence with the prophecies.

It is generally held that there is a real etymological connexion between *Nazara* and *nētser*. But, if reason to the contrary can be shown, the following words of Farrar (*Life of Christ*, i. 64-5) will still hold good: ‘The Old Testament is full of proofs that the Hebrews—who in philology accepted the views of the Analogists—attached immense and mystical importance to mere resemblances in the sound of words. To mention but one single instance, the first chapter of the prophet Micah turns almost entirely on such merely external similarities in what, for lack of a better term, I can only call the physiological quantity of sounds. St. Matthew, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, would without any hesitation have seen a prophetic fitness in Christ’s residence at this town of Galilee, because its name recalled the title by which he was addressed in the prophecy of Isaiah.’

But I am inclined to go still farther and acknowledge in the words of our text a special reference also to Zech. vi. 12. The Greek of our text is ‘Nazarene shall he be called’: since we, or at least the evangelic writer, have connected *Nazara* with *nētser*, let us substitute ‘Brancher’—‘Brancher shall he be called.’ Now compare with this the literal Hebrew of Zech. vi. 12—‘Branch [shall be] his name.’ Is the parallel accidental?

It is quite true that in Zech. vi. 12 the word is not *nētser* but *tsemach*. But the evangelic writer would not the less hold this prophecy fulfilled by the residence at Nazara. Hebrew, moreover, was a dead language even then, and that writer, if he knew Hebrew at all, was doubtless far more familiar with the Scriptures in his Targum (Aramaic paraphrase); which Targum (unfortunately lost) may have used the same word in Is. xi. 1 and Zech. vi. 12, just as our *Authorized Version* has done. In that case, if he knew that the original had *nētser* in the former place, he would naturally assume it to be the word used in the latter as well.

† The text outside the brackets represents the passage quoted by Epiphanius (*Haer. xxx.* 13)—(1) Καὶ ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων, (2) Καὶ ἔξηλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν Φαρισαῖοι καὶ ἐβαπτίσθησαν, καὶ πᾶσα Ἱερουσόλυμα. (3) Καὶ εἶχεν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἔνδυμα ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμῆλου καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὁσφὺν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ βρῶμα αὐτοῦ—φησί—μελι ἄγριον, οὐ δὲ γεῦσις ἦν τοῦ μάντυα, ὡς ἐγκρίεται ἐν ἑλαίῳ. The con-

¹ For note see next page.

Mark i. 4–6.
Luke iii. 2, 3.
(*Ebionite.*)

baptizing [* a baptism of repentance in the Jordan river??].

2. † And there came out unto him Pharisees and were baptized, and all Jerusalem.

3. And John had raiment of camel's hair and a leathern girdle about his loins, and his food [was] [§ locusts and ?] wild

jectural insertions in brackets will be explained one by one. Epiphanius also gives two other versions of (1) (quoted above, pp. 14, 15), widely different, and bearing strong evidence of corruption.

‡ I have already remarked (p. 15) that the copy from which the other Ebionite versions were altered seems to have contained the words 'in those days' of Matt. iii. 1.

* So the longer Ebionite versions. 'Baptism of repentance' occurs in Mark i. 4, Luke iii. 3, Acts xiii. 24, xix. 4. But the shorter reading is more likely to be the true one.

† Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxx. 15) charges the Ebionites with rejecting all the prophets after Joshua, and with altering the book called *Journeys of Peter* (*Περίοδοι Πέρρου*) so as to suppress all favourable mention of them. Had their Gospel originally some passage answering to Matt. iii. 3, Mark i. 3, Luke iii. 4, and did they for the same reason suppress it?

§ The Ebionite Gospel makes no mention of the *locusts* of Matt. iii. 4. Epiphanius so clearly and so often says that the Ebionites kept from animal food that we cannot refuse to believe him. He charges them with introducing two words into Fr. 25 (corresponding with Luke xxii. 15) so as to fix on Jesus the same antipathy to it. He also says that, among other tamperings with the book called 'Journeys of Peter,' they represented Peter as 'keeping from living things and meats, like themselves also, and from every other food made from flesh, since Ebion himself also and Ebionites keep from these altogether' (*Haer.* xxx. 15, ἐμψύχων τε τὸν αὐτὸν ἀπέχεσθαι καὶ κρεῶν, ὡς καὶ αὐτοὶ, καὶ πάτης ἄλλης ἐδωδῆς τῆς ἀπὸ σαρκῶν πεποιημένης λέγοντιν, ἐπειδήπερ καὶ αὐτὸς Ἐβίων καὶ Ἐβιωνῖται παντελῶς τούτων ἀπέχονται).

We have seen that some at least of the Ebionites tampered with this very fragment (see above, p. 15), and also that the absence of the quotation from Isaiah found in the Synoptics is suspicious. There is therefore strong ground for conjecturing that they had 'locusts' in their Gospel, and designedly struck it out. But of this it is nevertheless quite impossible to be certain.

honey, whereof the taste|| was of the manna, ¶like a cake [made] with oil [honey?].

¶ The oldest MS. of Epiphanius, Dindorf's V, reads $\dot{\eta}$ for $\ddot{\eta}$ —‘whereof the taste [was] that of manna.’ Either reading might arise (through the medium of $\ddot{\eta}$) out of the other, but the simpler hypothesis is that $\dot{\eta}$ is a mistake for $\ddot{\eta}$ —such mistakes being frequent in this MS. I have therefor, though with some doubts, placed in the text the reading of the four later MSS.

¶ Cf. the LXX version of Num. xi. 8, where it is said of manna —καὶ ἦν ἡ ἥδονὴ αὐτοῦ ὥσπερ γέῦμα ἐγκρίτι, εἴ τι ἐλαῖον, and the pleasure of it was as it were in taste a cake [made] of oil.’ The Hebrew text is uncertain, and the Jerusalem Targum and some other ancient authorities give ‘cakes [made] of honey.’ Now it is noticeable that Epiphanius in his remarks on the passage (quoted above, p. 13) accuses the Ebionites of substituting ‘cakes [made] with honey’ for the ‘locusts’ of the canonical Gospel. It is true that honey did enter into the making of the particular kind of cake called $\dot{\eta}\gamma\kappa\rho\iota\varsigma$, still the mention of it does not seem relevant. One is strongly tempted to think that the Ebionite MSS. exhibited the different readings of Num. xi. 8, and that Epiphanius, halting between the two, followed one reading in his text and another in his note. This would be quite in Epiphanius’s loose way: we have already seen that he gives two widely different versions of verse (1) of this fragment, and even quotes one of those versions a second time with further variations—seemingly without knowing what he is doing, at any rate without any explanation to his puzzled reader.

The common explanation of ‘wild honey’ is ‘honey made by wild bees.’ There have not, however, been wanting those who have explained it as meaning that exudation from the leaves of trees and shrubs, so common in Oriental countries (including the Jordan valley), which is gathered and used as we use butter or honey, and which is called by the Arabs ‘manna.’ A passage of Diodorus Siculus, who wrote about 8 B.C., seems to give the precise name μέλι ἄγριον, ‘wild honey,’ to this exudation: writing of the Nabataean Arabs he says—αὗτοὶ δὲ χρῶνται τροφῆ κρέασι καὶ γάλακτι, καὶ τῶν ἐκ τῆς γῆς φυομένων τοῖς ἐπιτηδείοις φύεται γὰρ παρ’ αὐτοῖς τὸ πέπερι ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων, καὶ μελι πολὺ τὸ καλούμενον ἄγριον, φῶ χρῶνται ποτῷ μεθ’ ὑδατος (xix. 731)—‘And they use for food flesh and milk, and the provisions afforded by what grows from the earth: for the pepper grows among them from the trees, and much honey, the same that is called wild honey, which they use for a drink with water.’ Here, even if we render φύεται ‘is produced,’ one gets an

*6. Matt. iii.

(Nazarene.)

1. [And ?] †¹ behold the mother of the
Lord and his brethren said to him 'John

impression that a vegetable honey is meant, and the fact that Diodorus does not speak of it as merely 'wild,' but 'the same that is called wild,' tends to show that it was something quite different from ordinary wild honey. This is the view also of Wesseling, Diodorus's editor, who moreover identifies the 'wild honey' of Matthew with that of his author. Suidas (about 1100 A.D.) in his Lexicon writes without any hesitation—'Ακρίς. Εἶδος ζωύφιου. Ἡσθιε δὲ ἀκρίδας ὁ Πρόδρομος, καὶ μέλι ἄγριον, ὅπερ ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων ἐπισυναγόμενον Μάννα τοῖς πόλλοις προσαγορεύεται—'Locust. A kind of tiny animal. The Forerunner also ate locusts and wild honey, which is gathered together from the trees and is commonly called Manna.' So Reland, the Orientalist, writes in his *Palaestina Illustrata*, i. 59, 'Mel copiosum hic provenit, praeter illud quod apes elaborant, in sylvis et manat ex arboribus'—'Here honey, besides that which the bees make, is produced in large quantity in the woods and oozes from trees,' and quotes to that effect Dioscorides (i. 37) and Pliny (xv. 7, xxiii. 4) as well as Diodorus, proceeding to identify with this vegetable honey that eaten by John the Baptist.

The concurrence of the Ebionite Gospel makes it probable that this is the true view. Suppose the crucial words in that Gospel to be a mere forgery of the very year in which Epiphanius copied them, and they would still show the meaning put upon the words 'wild honey' by natives of Palestine in 376 A.D. The fact that this meaning is not the obvious one is only another point in its favour: it would not have been put forward except on good grounds when there was so much simpler an explanation ready to hand.

* Jerome, *Adv. Pelag.* iii., Ecce mater Domini et fratres eius dicebant ei 'Ioannes Baptista baptizat in remissionem peccatorum: eamus et baptizemur ab eo.' Dixit autem eis 'Quid peccavi, ut vadam et baptizer ab eo? nisi forte hoc ipsum quod dixi ignorantia est.' A like account was contained in a work entitled the *Preaching of Paul*, and is thus referred to by the author of the *Tractatus de Rebaptismate*, printed among Cyprian's works (*Venet.* 1728, p. 743):—'Est autem adulterini huius, immo internecini baptismatis si quis alias auctor; tum etiam quidam ab iisdem ipsis haereticis propter eundem errorem confictus liber qui inscribitur *Pauli Praedicatio*, in quo libro contra omnes Scripturas et de peccato proprio confidentem invenies Christum, qui solus omnino nihil deliquit, et ad accipendum Ioannis baptismata paene invitum a matre sua Maria

¹ For notes see next page.

the Baptist baptizeth § for remission of sins: let us go and be baptized by him.'

2. But he said to them ||¹ ‘ Wherein

esse compulsum; item cum baptizaretur, ignem super aquam esse visum, quod in Evangelio nullo est scriptum’—‘This counterfeit and actually interneccine baptism has been promulgated in particular by a book forged by the same heretics in order to spread the same error: this book is entitled *the Preaching of Paul*, and in it, in opposition to all the Scriptures, you will find Christ, the only man who was altogether without fault, both making confession respecting his own sin, and that he was driven by his mother Mary almost against his will to receive the baptism of John; also that when he was baptized fire was seen upon the water, which is not written in any Gospel.’ We shall see that the incident of the fire at the Baptism was in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and it is natural to believe that the Preaching took its history from the Gospel rather than the Gospel its history from the Preaching. If so, and if (as in Part III. we shall find cause to think) the latter was the same book also known as *the Preaching of Peter*, we should have a witness for the Nazarene Gospel at least as early as the third quarter of the 2nd cent., when, as we know from Origen (*In Ioann. xiii. 17*), Heracleon quoted the Preaching.

† A word specially characteristic of Matthew, who has it 62 times, and Luke, who has it 56 or 57 times. Mark has it only 11 or 12 times, John only 4 times.

‡ Matt., Luke, and John very frequently give ‘Lord’ (=master, sir) as a form of speech to Jesus: Mark only once. In speaking of him Matthew only uses the word once (i.e. xxi. 3=‘the master hath need of them’), except we admit xxviii. 6 (doubtful reading); and Mark only once (xi. 3=Matt. xxi. 3), except we admit xvi. 19, 20 (verses of doubtful genuineness). But Luke so uses it 13 times (besides xxiv. 3, doubtful reading), and John 9 times.

§ Mark i. 4 and Luke iii. 3 speak of John as ‘preaching a baptism of repentance for remission of sins’ (*κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἀφεσίν ἀμαρτιῶν*), and Matt. iii. 6 says that the people were baptized by John ‘confessing their sins.’ ‘Remission of sins’ is not a common phrase in the N. T.: it occurs only once in Matt. (xxvi. 28 ‘for remission of sins’); twice in Mark (i. 4 ‘for remission of sins,’ iii. 29 ‘hath not remission’); and three times in Luke (i. 77 ‘in remission of their sins,’ iii. 3 ‘for remission of sins,’ xxiv. 47 ‘remission of sins’), who however has it five times in Acts (‘remission of sins’—ii. 38, v. 31, x. 43, xiii. 38, xxvi. 18). John never uses it. Paul has it only twice (Eph. i. 7 ‘the remis-

¹ For note see next page.

have I sinned that I should go and be baptized by him? * except perchance this very thing that I have said is ignorance.'

†7. Matt. iii. 13-17. 1. [And?], † when the people had been sion of the transgressions,' Col. i. 14 'the remission of the sins'), and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews twice ('remission'—ix. 22, x. 18). 'To remit sins' is a phrase used several times by each Synoptic and in Acts, once in John (xx. 23) and twice in 1 John (i. 9, ii. 12), but nowhere else in the N. T.

|| Cf. John viii. 46, 'Which of you convicteth me in respect of sin?'

* On the theology of this passage see Part III. Meanwhile, as offering at least a partial analogy to the suggestion of a limited knowledge on the part of Jesus, we may compare Luke ii. 52, 'And Jesus increased in wisdom and in stature,' and Mark xiii. 32, 'But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, NEITHER THE SON, but the Father.'

† Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. 13, Καὶ μερὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν πολλὰ ἐπιφέρει ὅτι (1) Τοῦ λαοῦ βαπτισθέντος ἥλθε καὶ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου. (2) Καὶ ὡς ἀνήλθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος ἡμέρας οἱ οἰγησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ εἶδεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον ἐν εἴσει περιστερᾶς κατελθούσης καὶ εἰσελθούσης εἰς αὐτόν. (3) Καὶ φωνὴ [ἐγένετο, omitted by Codex V] ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγοντα 'Σὺ μον ἐλ ὁ νιὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εἰδόκησα'. καὶ πάλιν, 'Ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.' (4) Καὶ εὐθὺς περιέλαμψε τὸν τόπον φῶς μέγα. 'Ο (ed. δν) ιὲών ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγει αὐτῷ Σὺ τίς ει, [Κύριε, omitted by Codex V]; (5) Καὶ πάλιν φωνὴ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ πρὸς αὐτόν, 'Οὗτός ἔστιν ὁ νιός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐφ' ὃν εἰδόκησα.' (6) Καὶ 'τότε' φησίν 'ὁ Ἰωάννης προσπεσὼν αὐτῷ ἔλεγε "Δέομαι, Κύριε, σύ με βάπτισον."' (7) 'Ο δὲ ἐκώλυσεν αὐτόν, λέγων "Αφες, ὅτι οὔτως ἔστι πρέπον πληρωθῆναι πάντα"—' And after saying a good many things it adds that when the people &c. . . . (6) And "then" it says "John fell down &c." The reader will see that the passage probably began with the conjunction *and* or *now*; he will also see I think that at the beginning of v. 6 the conjunction may belong either to *it says* or to *then John*; or that it would even be possible to divide thus—'And' (then it says) 'John.' Hilgenfeld prints v. 6 with the conjunction and v. 1 without any.

The words 'after saying a good many things' show that there was a considerable interval between this and the last fragment but one. The corresponding interval in Matthew is given to a speech by John, and the Ebionite Gospel may also have contained the last fragment (Nazarene).

‡ Cf. Luke (iii. 21) only—Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἄπαντα

Mark i. 9-11.
 Luke iii. 21, 22.
 (John i. 32, 33.)
 (Ebionite.)

baptized Jesus also came and was baptized by John.

2. § And as he went up the heavens were opened, and he saw the Holy Spirit in shape of a dove descending and entering into him.

τὸν λαὸν καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος, literally ‘And it came to pass when all the people had been baptized, Jesus also having been baptized.’

§ This verse is far nearer to Matt. than to the other accounts, with one very noticeable exception, ‘in shape of a dove’: cf. Luke iii. 22, ‘in a bodily shape like a dove.’ Hilgenfeld quotes Irenaeus (copied also by Hippolytus), Epiphanius, and Theodoret, all of whom say that Kerinthus and his sect held that the Spirit ‘descended into him in shape of a dove.’ We know that the Kerinthians used Matthew, if not the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

¶ Prof. Westcott (*Introduction*, 467) renders ‘which came down and came upon him.’ But ‘entering into him’ is the natural and almost necessary rendering of *εἰσελθόντης εἰς αὐτόν*; in the N. T. for instance there is not a single passage in which *εἰς* is used merely of motion to a person.

In Matt. iii. 16 D and Eusebius read *ἐρχόμενον εἰς αὐτόν*, ‘coming into him,’ instead of *εἰπόντες εἰς αὐτόν*, ‘coming upon him,’ while C E and some cursives have *πρὸς* ‘to,’ which points to *εἰς* as the original reading. In Mark i. 10 B D 13. 69. and a few others (followed by Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford) read *εἰς*. And in Luke iii. 22 D, the Old Latin, the revised Latin, and the Vulgate all have the same.

To my mind this version of the descent of the Holy Spirit is the much more intelligible one. No evangelist says that the dove flew away, and John (i. 32) tells us positively that ‘it abode (*ἔμεινεν*, “remained”) upon him,’ pointing to the Spirit ‘as not removing from Jesus’ (Alford). It would thus become, at least in appearance, fused in him. In this way the supernatural character of the dove would be manifest; but if on the other hand the dove flew away there would be no evidence of its being more than a mere dove. That Luke speaks of the Spirit as descending ‘in bodily shape of a dove’ does not in the least militate against such an explanation of the evangelic tradition: bodily shape does not necessitate bodily substance.

The various MS. readings yield strong reason to believe that ‘into’ was the original reading in Matthew, and in Luke we find 2nd cent. authority for it—older than any for ‘upon’ (in the parallel passage of Mark this authority is on the other side). But,

3. And a voice out of the heaven, saying, ‘Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased’: and again, * ‘I have this day begotten thee.’

4. And straightway † a great light

although Eusebius and Jerome (in the Vulgate of Luke) adopt this reading without suspicion, it was dangerously convenient for those who maintained that the divine Christ entered into the man Jesus at baptism: hence it would be glossed, and the gloss would pass into the text, or the pious copyist, fearful of sowing error, might even think it allowable to avoid that danger by changing a preposition.

* Instead of ‘Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased’ in Luke iii. 22, ‘Thou art my Son; I have this day begotten thee’ is read by D, the Old Latin, Clement of Alexandria, Methodius, Lactantius, Juvencus, Hilary, Faustus the Manichaean (quoted by Augustine, *Contra Faust.* lib. xxiii.), and once by Augustine without remark (*Enchir. ad Laurent.* c. xlix.), who elsewhere (*De Consensu Evang.* lib. ii. c. 14) says that it was found in some MSS., but was said not to be in the older Greek copies. Justin also in his accounts of the Baptism twice gives these as the words spoken by the voice (*Dial.* cc. 88, 103): the second of these references does not prove that he took them from a Gospel, but strongly implies it:—Καὶ γὰρ ωὗτος ὁ διάβολος ἄμα τῷ ἀναβῆναι αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου τῆς φωνῆς αὐτῷ λεχθείσης· ‘Υἱός μου εἰ σύ· ἐγώ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε·’ ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ‘Ἀποστόλων γέγραπται πρωτελθὼν αὐτῷ καὶ πειράζων μέχρι τοῦ εἰπεῖν αὐτῷ ‘Προσκύνησόν μοι’—‘For this devil, at the same time that he [i.e. Jesus] went up from the river Jordan, after the voice was uttered to him “Thou art my Son; I have this day begotten thee” is recorded in the memoirs of the Apostles to have come to him and tempted him so far as to say to him “Worship me.”’

In Matt. iii. 17 D, the Curetonian Syriac, Augustine, and the Old Latin MS. a (Codex Vercellensis) read ‘Thou art’ for ‘This is.’

† In Matt. iii. 15 the Old Latin MS. a, Codex Vercellensis, adds ‘And when he was being baptized a mighty light shone round about from the water, so that all they were afraid that had come thither,’ while g¹, Codex Sangermanensis, another MS. of the same version, has ‘And when Jesus was being baptized a great light kept shining from the water, so that all they were afraid that had come thither.’ The Latin texts are—Et cum baptizaretur (g¹ Iesus) lumen ingens (g¹ magnum) circumfulsit (g¹ fulgebat) de

shone around the place. And when John

aqua ita ut timerent omnes qui advenierant (*g¹* congregati erant). If translated from a lost Greek text, that might run as follows—καὶ βαπτιζομένου αὐτοῦ (*g¹* τοῦ Ἰησοῦ)—οὐ ἐν δὲ τῷ βαπτίζεσθαι αὐτὸν [*g¹* τὸν Ἰησοῦν]) περιέλαμψε (*g¹* ἔλαμπε) φῶς μέγα ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑδατος, ὃστε φοβεῖσθαι πάντας τοὺς παρελθόντας (*g¹* συνελθόντας). Both the above MSS. are very ancient and the Codex Vercellensis (4th cent.) is counted the most valuable example of the Old Latin.

Justin (*Dial.* c. 88) mentions the fire at Baptism in remarkable words—καὶ τότε ἐλθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην ποταμὸν ἔνθα ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐβάπτιζε, κατελθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ὑδωρ καὶ πῦρ ἀνήφθη ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ καὶ ἀναδύντος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑδατος ὡς περιστερὰν τὸ "Ἄγιον Πνεῦμα ἐπιπτῆναι ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἔγραψαν οἱ Ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ τοντοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡμῶν—" And then when Jesus had come to the Jordan river where John was baptizing, when Jesus had gone down to the water both a fire was kindled, and when he had gone up from the water the Holy Spirit is recorded by the Apostles of this same our Christ to have lighted upon him as a dove.' Tischendorf conjectures ἀνήφθαι for ἀνήφθη, and would thus make 'the Apostles' responsible also for the statement that 'a fire was kindled.'

It will be seen from a note on p. 36 that the *Preaching of Paul* related that 'when he was baptized, fire was seen upon the water' (cum baptizaretur, ignem super aquam esse visum).

The fire is mentioned in the 7th Sibylline book, l. 83: ὕδασιν ἀγνοῖς 'Παιῶν σὸν βάπτισμα δί' οὐ πυρὸς ἐξεφαάνθης—'with holy waters sprinkling thy baptism—through which [or whom] thou wast manifested out of fire.'

There can be little doubt that Juvencus alludes to it in his account, 'manifesta Dei praesentia claret,' 'the presence of God is manifest in splendour,' while the Syriac liturgy of Severus (early 6th cent.) says 'Without fire, and without wood, did the waters glow when the Son of God came to be baptized in Jordan' (Dodd, 14).

The writer of *Supernatural Religion* (4th ed. i. 323) says 'Credner has pointed out that the marked use which was made of fire or lights at Baptism by the Church during early times probably rose out of this tradition regarding the fire which appeared in Jordan at the baptism of Jesus.' It might, however, have been suggested by Matt. iii. 11, 'he shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire—which consideration prevents me from claiming in illustration the passage quoted by Hilgenfeld from Eusebius (*De Pasch.* c. 4), δί' ὕδατος καὶ πυρὸς 'Ἄγιον Πνεῦματος ἀγαγενηθέντες, 'having been regenerated through water and fire of the Holy Spirit.' Or, since baptism was called in



saw it he saith unto him * ‘Who art thou, [Lord?]?’

5. And again a voice out of heaven unto him, ‘This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.’

6. Then John fell down before him and said ‘I pray thee, Lord, baptize thou me.’

7. But he prevented him, saying ‘Let be; for thus it is becoming that all things should be fulfilled.’

early days φωτισμός, ‘illumination,’ we might regard the use of lights as symbolical of spiritual enlightenment. The late Mr. Marriott, however, in Smith and Cheetham’s *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, shows from Cyril of Jerusalem that in 347 A.D. baptism took place at night, and, since there is nothing to show that this was not the practice still earlier, very reasonably believes the original use of lights to have been free from any symbolical meaning.

Is it possible that a reference to this tradition lurks in 1 Pet. iv. 14, ‘for the spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you’—ὅτι τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται? The phrase ἀναπαύεσθαι ἐπί τινα, ‘to rest (i.e. take rest) upon a person,’ is found nowhere else in the N. T., but in the fragment which immediately follows this we are told that a voice came from heaven at the Baptism saying ‘My son, in all the prophets did I await thee, that thou mightest come and I might rest in thee’—requiescerem in te. Can the Spirit of Glory mean the Spirit of the Shechinah or visible glory of God? The previous verse confirms the idea that a reference to some event in the life of Jesus may be intended: —ἀλλὰ καθὸ κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασιν χαίρετε ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀποκαλύψει τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ χαρήτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι, ‘but according as ye share in the sufferings of the Christ rejoice that ye may rejoice with pride in the revelation also of his glory.’ I do not press this, but it does not seem to me impossible: we shall hereafter find a reference by Paul to a tradition of which except in the Gospel according to the Hebrews no other trace has been preserved.

* The very question (*Tίς εἰ, Κύριε;*) asked by Paul in response to the heavenly voice, Acts ix. 5, xxii. 8, xxvi. 15. In his case also there was ‘much light’ (φῶς ἵκανόν, xxii. 6) ‘shining around’ him (περιλάμψαν με, xxvi. 13). Is the parallel accidental? But it must be noted that Codex Venetus omits ‘Lord.’

† 8. Matt. iii. at end.
(Nazarene.)

1. And it came to pass, when the Lord had come up from the water, the entire fountain of the Holy Spirit descended and † rested upon him and said to him
2. ‘My § son, in all the prophets did I await thee, that thou mightest come and I might rest in thee;
3. ‘For thou art my rest; thou art my firstborn Son that || reignest for ever.’

¶ 9. Matt. iv. 5.
Luke iv. 9.
(Nazarene?)

in [-to?] Jerusalem.

† Jerome, *Comm. in Isai. xi. 2*, (1) Factum est autem, quum ascendisset Dominus de aqua, descendit fons omnis Spiritus Sancti et requievit super eum et dixit illi (2) ‘Fili mi, in omnibus prophetis expectabam te, ut venires et requiescerem in te; (3) Tu es enim requies mea; tu es filius mens primogenitus qui regnas in sempiternum.’

‡ Is. xi. 2, ‘And the Spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him,’ i.e. the branch of Jesse. I have already quoted a parallel in 1 Pet. iv. 14. ‘Rested upon him’ is the reading of the Curetonian Syriac in Matt. iii. 16.

§ See note on Fr. 30.

|| The only passage in the Gospels in which Jesus is spoken of as *reigning* is Luke i. 33, ‘he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.’

¶ Tischendorf’s Cod. A., margin, Τὸ Ιουδαϊκὸν οὐκ ἔχει ‘Εἰς τὴν ἀγίαν πόλιν,’ ἀλλ᾽ ‘ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ’—‘The Jewish has not “into the holy city” but “in Jerusalem.”’ On which Hilgenfeld, after his manner, rushes to the conclusion that ‘Jesus is not miraculously conveyed out of the desert into the holy city, as the canonical Matthew has reported, but is placed at Jerusalem on the summit of the temple.’ According, then, to Hilgenfeld the Gospel according to the Hebrews either made Jerusalem, instead of the desert, the general scene of the temptation, or else divided the temptation into two—one occurring in the desert, and the other during some after visit of Jesus to Jerusalem. There is, however, no need to draw this startling conclusion from a single preposition whose context is lost. In the first place, for aught we know, ‘in Jerusalem’ may have followed the words ‘on a pinnacle of the temple.’ Secondly, reference to a Greek lexicon or to Bruder’s *Concordance* would have shown numerous instances of the use of ἐν ‘in’ with verbs conveying an

*10. Matt. v. 22.
(*Nazarene.*)

In the Gospel . . . according to the Hebrews he is set down among the greatest criminals who hath grieved the spirit of his † brother.

†11.? Matt. v. 24.
(*Nazarene.*)

And be ye never joyful save when ye have looked upon your brother in charity.

§12. Matt. vi. 11.
Luke xi. 3.
(*Nazarene.*)

[Our bread?] of the morrow [give us to-day?].

idea of motion where we should look for *εἰς* ‘into.’ Thirdly, in Jerome’s Greek version of the Gospel, from which we may suppose the quotations to come, the accompanying verb may have been *καταθέρω*, ‘to set down,’ or some other verb which might be naturally followed by ‘in.’

* Jerome, *Comm. in Ezech.* xviii. 7, In Evangelio quod iuxta Hebraeos Nazaraei legere consueverunt inter maxima ponitur crimina qui fratris sui spiritum contristaverit. Hilgenfeld refers this and the next fragment to Matt. xviii. 6, 7, which must be a clerical error for Matt. xviii. 16, 17 or thereabouts. That passage, however, refers to the sins of a brother against oneself, whereas the parallel in Matt. v. 22 is very remarkable.

+ Matthew uses ‘brother’ in this sense 15 times, Luke 6 times, John twice, Mark never. In Acts and most of the Epistles it is very common indeed.

‡ Jerome, *Comm. in Ephes.* v. 4, Ut in Hebraico quoque Evangelio legimus Dominum ad discipulos loquentem: ‘Et nunquam,’ inquit, ‘laeti sitis nisi quum fratrem vestrum videritis in caritate.’ If this fragment came anywhere else it might possibly be in Matt. xviii. between vv. 14 and 15.

§ Jerome, *Comm. in Matt.* vi. 11, In Evangelio quod appellatur ‘secundum Hebraeos’ pro ‘supersubstantiali pane’ reperi *Mahar*, quod dicitur *crastinum*—ut sit sensus ‘Panem nostrum crastinum,’ id est, futurum, ‘da nobis hodie’—‘In the Gospel which is called “according to the Hebrews” instead of “supersubstantial bread” I found “Mahar,” that is to say, “of the morrow,” making the sense “Our bread of the morrow,” that is, of the future, “give us to-day.”’

After the exhaustive excursus of Bishop Lightfoot (*On a fresh Revision*, App. I. 195–234) there ought no longer to be any doubt that *ἐπιωνίσιον* (A. V. ‘daily’) is an adjective formed from (*ἡ*) *ἐπιωνίσα* (*ἡμέρα*), ‘(the) following (day),’ ‘the morrow.’

|| 13. Matt. x. 25, Enough for the disciple to be as the
(Ebionite.) master.

¶ 14. ? Matt. x. after I will choose me the good, those good
33. whom my ** Father in the heavens hath
 given me.††¹

In conjecturally filling in the remainder of the sentence I have not imagined that the translation of Jerome, ‘Our bread of the morrow give us to-day,’ is meant for a rendering of the Aramaic passage. But, seeing that Matt. and Luke both give this order of words, which is also somewhat unusual in Greek, I presume that it represents the original Aramaic order.

|| Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. 26, of the Ebionites, Φασὶ δὲ καὶ οὖντοι, κατὰ τὸν ἐκείνων ληρώδη λόγον, Ὄπρετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ εἶναι ως ὁ διδάσκαλος —‘And they too say according to the silly argument of the Kerinthians “Enough &c.”’ He repeats the text in the same form c. 30. He had previously mentioned (*Haer.* xxviii. 5) that the Kerinthians quoted it ‘from the Gospel,’ and he then gives it with ἵνα γένηται ‘that he be’ in place of εἶναι ‘to be’: this agrees verbatim with the Greek Matthew except that the latter adds αὐτοῦ, ‘his’ master.

¶ Twice quoted in the Syriac version of Eusebius’s *Theophania* (of the Greek of which only fragments remain): see Prof. S. Lee’s edition iv. 13, pp. 234, 235. On p. 234 the Syriac runs as follows:

بِّنَانَ مُهْلَكٍ مُهْلَكٍ مُهْلَكٍ مُهْلَكٍ مُهْلَكٍ مُهْلَكٍ

which Lee translates ‘I will select to myself these things; very excellent are those whom my Father who is in heaven has given me.’ In the second quotation, on p. 235, ‘these things’ بِّنَانَ is omitted, and Lee translates ‘I will select to myself the very excellent, those &c.’ Ewald’s version was ‘I choose me the good; the good are they whom my Father in heaven gave me,’ but Hilgenfeld calls this inaccurate, and gives on the authority of Merx the rendering I have placed, after him, in the text.

The quotation is first brought in with the words ‘The cause, therefor, of the divisions of soul which came to pass in houses Himself taught, as we have found in a place in the Gospel existing among the Jews in the Hebrew language, in which it is said &c.’ Eusebius is commenting on Matt. x. 34, Luke xii. 51.

** ‘Heavenly Father,’ ‘Father in heaven’ are phrases almost confined to Matt., where they occur 20 times—but in Mark only twice, in Luke only once, and nowhere else in the N. T.

¹ For note see next page.

*15. Matt. xii. 10.

Mark iii.

Luke vi.

(Nazarene.)

I was a mason, seeking sustenance by my hands: I beseech thee, Jesus, that thou restore me health, that I may not shamefully beg for food.

†16. Matt. xii. 47–50.

Mark iii. 32–5.

Luke viii. 20, 21.

(Ebionite.)

1. . . . ‘Behold thy mother and thy brethren stand without.’

† Cf. John xvii. 6, ‘the men which thou gavest me out of the world, thine they were, and thou gavest them me,’ and ib. 9, ‘I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me.’

* Jerome, *Comm. in Matt.* xii. 13, In Evangelio quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitae . . . homo iste qui aridam habet manum caementarius scribitur, istiusmodi vocibus auxilium precans, ‘Caementarius eram, manibus victum quaeritans: precor te, Iesu, ut mihi restitues sanitatem, ne turpiter mendicem cibos’—‘In the Gospel which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use . . . that man who has the dry hand is described as a mason, beseeching help in words of this sort, “I was &c.”’

† Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. 14, Πάλιν δὲ ἀριοῦνται εἶναι αὐτὸν ἀνθρωπὸν δῆθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου οὖν εἴρηκεν ὁ Σωτὴρ ἐν τῷ ἀναγγελῆναι αὐτῷ (edd. αὐτὸν) ὅτι (1) ‘Ιδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἔξω ἐστήκασιν,’ ὅτι (2) ‘Τίς μού ἔστι μήτηρ καὶ ἀδελφοί;’ (3) Καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς ἔφη ‘Οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ ἀδελφοί μους καὶ ἡ μήτηρ, οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα τοῦ πατρός μου’—‘And again they [the Ebionites] deny that he was man, forsooth from the word which the Saviour spoke (when message was brought him “Behold thy mother and thy brethren stand without”), “Who is &c.”’

Codex V reads in (3) ‘my brethren and mother and brethren’ (καὶ ἀδελφοὶ—no οἱ), and this text Hilgenfeld prints, putting a comma after μήτηρ but none before οἱ ποιοῦντες. He does not vouchsafe the slightest justification of this splendid audacity, but I suppose he construes ‘and brethren [are] they that do the wishes of my Father.’ I am strongly prepossessed in favour of the MS. which has revealed to us the true reading φύσει ὅν for φύτον in *Haer.* xxx. 6—to say nothing of its superior antiquity to the other MSS.—but I really cannot accept this. Καὶ ἀδελφοὶ stands either for καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ‘and brethren’ accidentally repeated, or for καὶ οἱ ἀδελφαὶ ‘and sisters’ (cf. Mark iii. 35).

In (1) the ‘desiring to speak with thee’ of Matt. is omitted, but there is no other difference. From Luke (viii. 20) there is a little more difference, and from Mark (iii. 32) much more.

2. . . . ‘Who is my mother and brethren?’

3. And he stretched out his hand over the disciples, and said ‘These are my brethren and mother, that do the ‡ wishes of my Father.’

§ 17. Matt. xv. 24.

I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

In (2) Matt. has ‘who is my mother (*ἥ μήτηρ μου*) and who are my brethren?’ Luke omits the clause altogether. Mark has ‘Who is my mother (*ἥ μήτηρ μου*) and my brethren?’ which is nearer.

In (3) Matt. differs widely ‘Behold my mother and my brethren: for whosoever doeth the wish (*τὸ θέλημα*) of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother and sister and mother’—not to dwell on the slight differences between ‘the disciples’ and ‘his disciples,’ *ἔφη* and *εἶπεν*, which might be due to Epiphanius. Mark differs much more, but for ‘the wish’ (*τὸ θέλημα*) B reads ‘the wishes’ (*τὰ θελήματα*). Luke has ‘My mother and my brethren are these, that hear and do the word of God’ (*Μήτηρ μου καὶ ἀδελφοί μου ὅντοι εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιοῦντες*), and does not represent Jesus as pointing to any one.

In the so-called 2nd Epistle of Clement, we are told (ix. 11) that ‘the Lord said’ (*εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος*) ‘My brethren are these, that do the wish of my Father’ (*Ἄδελφοί μου ὅντοι εἰσιν οἱ ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου*). This is far nearer to the Ebionite Gospel.

‡ Cf. Acts xiii. 22 (‘my wishes’) and Eph. ii. 3 (‘the wishes of the flesh’), the only places in the N. T. where the pl. *θελήματα* occurs, except in the various reading of B on Mark iii. 35. According to Tischendorf it is common in the LXX version of the Psalms and Isaiah.

§ Origen, *De Princ.* iv. 22, ‘Ἐπάν φάσκῃ ὁ Σωτὴρ ‘Οὐκ ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραήλ,’ οὐκ ἐκλαμβάνομεν ταῦτα ὡς οἱ πτωχοὶ τῇ διαιροίτε ‘Ἐβιωναῖοι ὥστε ὑπολαβεῖν ἐπὶ τοὺς σαρκινοὺς Ἰσραηλίτας προηγουμένως τὸν Χριστὸν ἐπιδεδημηκέναι—‘When the Saviour declares ‘I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel’ we do not take this as the poor-witted Ebionites, so as to suppose that the Christ came and dwelt of fore intent among the Israelites of the flesh.’ Origen in calling the Ebionites ‘poor-witted’ puns on their name, *Ebionim*, ‘the poor.’ The quotation agrees exactly with Matt. xv. 24.

*18. Matt. xvi. 17.
(*Nazarene?*)

†19. Matt. xviii. 22.
Luke xxvii. 3, 4.
(*Nazarene.*)

Son of John.

1. He saith ‘If thy brother hath sinned in †word and hath made thee amends, seven times in a day receive him.’

2. § Simon his disciple said unto him ‘Seven times in a day?’

3. The Lord answered and said unto him ‘I tell thee also, unto seventy times seven: for in the prophets likewise, after that they were ||anointed by the Holy Spirit, utterance of sin was found.’

* Tischendorf’s Codex A, margin, Τὸν Ἰωάννην· ‘Υἱὸν Ἰωάννου’—‘The Jewish: “son of John.”’ No doubt the Aramaic was *Bar Jochanan*. There is hardly any question that the name, *Jona*, of Simon’s father is not the same as *Jonah*, but is a contraction of *Jochanan*, John. In all other places in the N. T. where the name of Simon’s father occurs (John i. 43, xxi. 15, 16, 17) recent editors rightly read ‘son of John.’

† Jerome, *Adv. Pelag.* iii. 2, Et in eodem volumine “Si peccaverit,” inquit, “frater tuus in verbo et satis tibi fecerit, septies in die suscipe eum.” Dixit illi Simon discipulus ejus “Septies in die?” Respondit Dominus et dixit ei “Etiam ego dico tibi usque septuagies septies; etenim in prophetis quoque, postquam uncti sunt Spiritu Sancto, inventus est sermo peccati.”

‡ Matthew and Luke (xvii. 4) do not limit the offense to offense of speech. It is possible that Jerome rendered too literally here, and that the proper rendering would be ‘in a thing,’ ‘in anything.’ In Hebrew ‘word’ is not seldom used in the sense of *a subject of speech*, a ‘thing,’ just as our *thing* and the Latin *res* mean *a subject of thought*. Dr. Hermann Adler tells me that this usage, though rarer in Aramaic, is not unknown to it.

§ This style occurs again in the next fragment; it is not found in the Four Gospels. Peter is spoken of as plain ‘Simon’ only once in Matthew and John, but 7 times in Mark and 8 times in Luke. The title ‘disciple’ is a specially favourite one with John (who uses it some 80 times), next with Matthew (about 80 times), and Mark (45 times); whereas Luke has it only about 40 times, or *in proportion to his length* only twice for every five times that Matthew and Mark have it, and for every 7 times that John has it. He also uses the title ‘Apostle’ 6 times, while each of the others has it only once.

|| Cf. Acts x. 38, ‘God anointed him with the Holy Spirit.’

¶20. Matt. xix. 16–24. (16) 1. ** The other of the rich men said
Mark x. 17–25. to him ‘Master, what good thing shall I
Luke xviii. 18–25. do and live?’
(Nazarene.)

Luke uses the verb ‘anoint’ twice more—Gosp. iv. 18, Acts iv. 27; it is only found twice again in the N. T.—not at all in the other three Gospels.

¶ Latin trans. of Origen (see above, p. 4), (1) *Dixit ad eum alter divitium ‘Magister, quid bonum faciens vivam?’* (2) *Dixit ei ‘Homo, legem [Migne has leges, sic] et prophetas fac.’* (3) *Respondit ad eum ‘Feci.’* (4) *Dixit ei ‘Vade, vende omnia quae possides et divide pauperibus et veni, sequere me.’* (5) *Coepit autem dives scalpere caput suum, et non placuit ei.* Et dixit ad eum Dominus ‘Quomodo dicis “Legem feci et prophetas”?—quoniam scriptum est in lege “Diliges proximum tuum sicut te ipsum,” et ecce multi fratres tui, filii Abrahae, amicti sunt stercore, morientes praefame, et domus tua plena est multis bonis, et non egreditur omnino aliquid ex ea ad eos.’ (6) Et conversus dixit Simoni discipulo suo, sedenti apud se, ‘Simon, fili Iohannae, facilius est camelum intrare per foramen acus quam divitem in regnum caelorum.’

** The three Synoptic Gospels only mention one rich man—indeed, only one man, rich or poor—as asking a question of Jesus at this time. Hilgenfeld conjectures that in the Gospel according to the Hebrews the entire passage ran somewhat as follows:—‘And behold there came to him two rich men. The one said “Good master”—But he said “Call me not good: for he that is good is one, the Father in the heavens.” The other &c.” Call me not good is the reading of the Clementine Homilies (xviii. 3, 17) in Matt. xix. 17, and the Father in the heavens is added to the answer of Jesus by them, by Justin (*my Father &c.*) once (*Dial.* 101—but God who made all things, *Apol.* i. 16), and by the Marcionians (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* I. xx. 2): these, however, say nothing of two questioners.

This number two may be thought to afford a straw’s weight of presumption in favour of the Matthaeian origin of this version. It occurs in Matthew much more often than in the other Gospels, and in viii. 28 and xx. 30 he has represented Jesus as healing two demoniacs and two blind men where Mark and Luke only mention one: on the other hand he (with Mark) only speaks of one angel at the sepulchre, where Luke and John mention two.

The now (rightly) accepted reading in Matt. xix. 16 is ‘Master,’ not ‘Good Master,’ and in xix. 17 ‘Why askest thou me of the good? he that is good is One.’

(17) 2. He said unto him * ‘Man, perform the law and † the prophets.’

(20) 3. He answered him ‘I have performed them.’

(21) 4. He said unto him ‡ ‘Go, sell all that thou hast and divide it to the poor, and come, follow me.’

(22) 5. But the rich man began to scratch his head, and it pleased him not. And the Lord said unto him ‘How sayest thou “I have performed the law and the prophets”? seeing that it is written in the law § “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,” and behold many of thy brethren, || sons of Abraham, are clad with dung, dying for hunger, and thy house is full of much goods, and there goeth out therefrom nought at all unto them.’

(23–4) 6. And he turned and said to Simon his ¶ disciple, ** sitting by him,

* This form of address is only found in Luke xii. 14, xxii. 58, 60.

† This conjunction of the prophets, as the base of a code of life, with the law is peculiar to Matthew: cf. vii. 12, ‘Therefor, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.’ And xxii. 40, ‘On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.’

‡ Luke (xviii. 22) omits ‘Go,’ but otherwise he is a little nearer to the Gospel according to the Hebrews than are Matt. and Mark: cf. his πάτερ ὅσα ἔχεις with their σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα and ὅσα ἔχεις; and his διάδος with their δός.

§ Cf. Matt. xix. 19. Mark and Luke omit this injunction.

|| Cf. Luke xix. 9, ‘son of Abraham,’ and xiii. 16, ‘daughter of Abraham.’ John has ‘seed of Abraham’ twice and ‘children of Abraham’ once.

¶ See note on the last fragment.

** It was the custom for the scholars of a Rabbi to sit on the floor or benches, while the Rabbi himself sat a little above them on a raised platform: thus Paul speaks of himself as brought up ‘at the feet of Gamaliel’ (Acts xxii. 3). As regards the phrase

‘Simon, son of †† John, it is easier for a camel to enter through the eye of a needle than a rich man into the kingdom of the heavens.’

21. ††*Matt. xxi. 9.*
Mark xi. 10.
Luke xix. 38.
John xii. 13.
(Nazarene.)

§§¹ Hosanna ||| in the heights.

‘sitting by,’ Hilgenfeld quotes Josephus (*Bell. Iud.* i. 6, 5), *ἥσαν δὲ οὐκ ὀλίγους παρεδρεύοντες αὐτῷ τῶν μανθανόντων* ‘and there were not a few of the scholars sitting by him’ (i.e. Judas the Essaean). Jesus himself certainly liked to teach, as a Rabbi, sitting: see *Matt. v. 1, xiii. 1, 2, xv. 29 (xxiv. 3?), xxvi. 55, Mark iv. 1, ix. 35, Luke v. 3, John vi. 3.* It may be observed that this little bit of Jewish colouring is supplied by Matthew more often than in the other three Evangelists together, and that he alone speaks of the Scribes and Pharisees as ‘sitting in Moses’ seat’ (xxiii. 2).

†† See note on Fragment 18. ‘Iohannae’ in Origen’s translator points to a Greek *Iωαννᾶ*: cf. *Iωνᾶ*.

‡‡ Jerome in a letter to Pope Damasus (Martianay’s ed. iv. 148) after explaining the word *Osanna* proceeds thus:—Finally, Matthew, who composed the Gospel in the Hebrew language, put in these words, *Osanna barrama*, that is ‘Osanna in the heights,’ because when the Saviour was born salvation reached as far as heaven, that is even to the heights, peace being made not only in earth but also in heaven (Denique Matthaeus, qui *Evangelium Hebraeo sermone conscripsit, ita posuit, Osanna barrama, id est ‘Osanna in excelsis,’ quod Salvatore nascente salus in coelum usque, id est, etiam ad excelsa pervenerit, pace facta non solum in terra sed et in coelo*). The date of the letter is about 380 A.D.

It seems to me (as to Anger and Hilgenfeld) almost certain that Jerome is here quoting the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and for three reasons (1) he was not the man to *conjecture* that Matthew wrote *barrama* and then state it as a *fact*; (2) the introduction of the word is so altogether irrelevant that I suppose him to have introduced it simply as an example of what he believed to be the veritable Aramaic of Matthew; (3) it is almost certain (see note on p. 18) that he had copied the Nazarene Gospel before he wrote this letter to Damasus, and it is not to be believed that, holding his opinion of it, he should say that Matthew wrote Aramaic words which it did not contain. Yet see *Addenda*.

¹ For notes see next page.

* 22. ? End of Matt. *A story of a woman accused before Jesus
xxi.
of many sins
(Nazarene?)*

Hilgenfeld prints as the original בְּרָמָא אַוְשָׁעֵנָא and says that Anger refers the second word to either the Hebrew גְּרִימָה or the Chaldaic נְגָרָה.

The fragment corresponds verbatim with Matthew and Mark, not so with Luke and John.

§§ ‘Hosanna,’ ‘O save,’ is from Ps. cxviii. 25, one of the Hallel psalms, sung about a week before the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem and appointed to be sung again a week later at the Passover. But according to the chronology of Matthew (against Mark) his entry was immediately followed by the purification of the Temple, and if we might trust this chronology and suppose also that he had allowed his intention to become known, another very remarkable explanation of their quoting this psalm would commend itself to our acceptance. At the Feast of Dedication, which commemorated the purification of the Temple by Judas Maccabaeus, ‘they bare branches, and fair boughs, and palms also, and sang psalms’ (2 Macc. x. 6, 7), and we know that Ps. cxviii. was among the psalms sung at this feast. It would thus appear as if the crowd hearing of the intention of Jesus repeated the ceremonies of the Feast of Dedication.

|| That is ‘in heaven.’ Hilgenfeld adduces Ecclesiasticus xxvi. 16 (Ἄλιος ἀνατέλλων ἐν ὑψίστοις Κυρίου ‘the sun rising in heights of the Lord’) and xlivi. 9 (where the moon is spoken of as κάλλος στερεῶν, δόξα ἀστρων, κόσμος φωτίζων, ἐν ὑψίστοις κύριος ‘beauty of heaven, glory of stars, a shining ornament, lord in heights,’ where I of course prefer the reading of AC, κόσμος φωτίζων ἐν ὑψίστοις Κυρίου ‘a shining ornament in heights of the Lord’); and Luke ii. 14 (δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ, A. V. ‘Glory to God in the highest’) and particularly xix. 38, the description of this very scene, where the cry of the multitude is given as ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη, καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις, A. V. ‘peace in heaven and glory in the highest.’ The meaning of the entire phrase may be ‘Let Hosanna be sung in heaven.’

* Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39) says that Papias ‘has published also another relation of a woman accused of many sins before the Lord, which the Gospel according to the Hebrews contains’ (for the Greek see p. 8, note).

The passage I have inserted above, as probably identical in substance at least with the narrative mentioned by Eusebius, is the Story of the Woman taken in Adultery printed in our Bibles as John vii. 53–viii. 11, but whose genuineness as a part of the Fourth Gospel is disallowed by an overwhelming preponderance of critical

[substantially, it would seem, and perhaps almost verbally, as follows :—

opinion. The recent textual editors, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, and Westcott and Hort, all deny it the same authorship. Of living English writers of note only McClellan opposes, only Farrar hesitates: Ellicott, Hammond, Lightfoot, Sanday, Scrivener, and even Wordsworth, allow that the Story of the Woman taken in Adultery is an interpolation. In *Appendix F* I have given a minute analysis of the evidence for and against it.

Several of the above writers conjecture that the story is the same with that told by Papias. Mr. McClellan (*New Test.* 721) objects that the woman spoken of by Papias was ‘secretly accused’ ($\deltaιαβληθείσης$) of many sins, whereas the Woman taken in Adultery was *openly* accused, and of one sin only. Now in the first place to translate $\deltaιαβληθείσης$ ‘secretly accused’ is to strain its meaning unwarrantably, and in the second place, as Tischendorf says, the words ‘from this time no longer sin’ seem to indicate that the woman had been a frequent sinner. And it is impossible to escape from the fact that Rufinus, in his translation of Eusebius, paraphrased his author’s words so as to make him say that Papias published ‘another relation concerning an [or the] adulterous woman who was accused by the Jews before the Lord’ (*aliam historiam de muliere adultera quae accusata est a Iudeis apud Dominum*). Now if it can be said confidently of any man but Jerome that he *must* have read through the Gospel according to the Hebrews that man is Rufinus. The fellow-student of Jerome at Aquileia, he went with him to the East in 371 A.D., he was in Palestine between 377 and 397, up to 393 he was on the most cordial terms with Jerome, and for the last seven years of that time the two were living a little more than an hour’s walk from each other, Jerome at Bethlehem, Rufinus at Jerusalem. Now it is almost certain that Jerome had copied the Nazarene Gospel not later than 379 A.D., he began to quote it in his commentaries in 387, and in 392 he speaks of having lately rendered it into Greek and Latin. Is it to be credited that he should render it into two languages for the reading of all the civilized world, and that neither of these translations should have been read by his intimate friend living some half-a-dozen miles off? Mr. McClellan himself would not say so, and putting together the evidence of Eusebius and Rufinus (who translated Eusebius about 408) I must regard it as *absolutely certain that the Gospel according to the Hebrews contained a story of an adulteress accused before Jesus.*

But, asks Mr. McClellan, if contained in the Gospel according

1. And they went each to his own

to the Hebrews, 'how could it have been (with some trifling exceptions) universally transferred to the *Gospel of St. John*, and never once to the more kindred *Gospel of St. Matthew*? ' Farrar seems to feel the same difficulty as to its interpolation into *John*, and many of those who repudiate the genuineness of the passage must have stumbled over it in their own minds. The question can, I believe, be answered satisfactorily, as follows.

If the reader turns to p. 7, he will see that Eusebius says that Papias 'also transfers to his own work other accounts, by the afore-said Aristion, of the Lord's discourses, and traditions of the Elder JOHN.' Of course when he repeated one of the Elder John's traditions he must have mentioned him by name, or Eusebius would not have known whence they were derived. My theory is that Papias in telling the Story of the Woman taken in Adultery said that it was related by John, meaning the Elder; that some one else supposed him to mean the Apostle, and added it to his own copy of the Fourth Gospel, perhaps in the place where we now find it, or perhaps as an appendix at the end of the Gospel, whence it may have been transferred by the next copyist.

It is easy to see why this particular place was found for it. It seemed to come most naturally *just before* viii. 15, where Jesus says 'Ye judge after the flesh; I judge no man'; and *just after* c. vii., where there had been far more mention of 'Moses' and 'the law' than in any other part of the Gospel—'Moses' being named 4 times, and 'the law' 5 times, against twice in any other chapter—and there being no good opportunity of inserting it before v. 52. Again Jesus is mentioned twice in c. vii. and once in c. viii. as *teaching in the Temple*, but nowhere else in the Gospel.

The story evidently belongs to the Passion-week, when 'in the day-time he was teaching in the Temple; and at night he went out, and abode in the mount that is called the Mount of Olives. And all the people came early in the morning to him in the Temple, for to hear him' (Luke xxi. 37-8).

Hitzig would find room for this incident between Mark xii. 17 and 18, that is between the question of the Herodians and that of the Sadducees: but this is contradicted by Matt. xxii. 23 which says that the Sadducees came to him 'the same day' as the Herodians. It might be put after Matt. xxii., if that chapter did not end with the statement that 'neither durst any man from that day forth ask him any more questions.' But there seems no reason why we should not give it a place in time between Matt. xxi. and xxii., that is between the parables of the Wicked Husbandmen and the Wedding-

house, and * Jesus went to the Mount of the Olives.

feast—especially as we are told in Mark xii. 12 that after the former parable ‘they left him and went their way.’ It would then come before the questions of the Herodians, Sadducees, and Pharisees, immediately after which we find from Mark xii. 35 and 41 that he was ‘teaching in THE TEMPLE’ and that he ‘sat over against the treasury’—facts which do not of course prove anything for this theory, but are simply quoted to show its consistency with what we know of the actions of Jesus on this particular day.

As to the text of the passage, the number of various readings is so unparalleled, and so many of the most ancient MSS., versions, and Fathers fail us, that its exact determination is hopeless. I subjoin the text which I frame, and which I have rendered as closely as possible. The reader who compares it with the notes to this passage in Tischendorf’s eighth edition will see that in every case where he has definitely indicated one reading as preferable to the rest I have been able to agree with him.

(1) Καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ἔκαστος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν.

(2) Ὁρθρουν δὲ πάλιν παρεγένετο εἰς τὸ Ἱερόν, καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς.

(3) "Ἄγουσιν δὲ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι γυναικα ἐπὶ μοιχείᾳ κατειλημένην.

(4) Καὶ στήσατες αὐτὴν ἐν μέσῳ εἰπον αὐτῷ ‘Διδάσκαλε, αὕτη ἡ γυνὴ κατειληπται ἐν αὐτοφώρῳ μοιχευομένῃ’

(5) ‘Ἐν δὲ τῷ νόμῳ ἡμῖν Μωϋσῆς ἐτετίλατο τὰς τοιαύτας λιθάζειν· σὺ οὖν τί λέγεις;’

(6) Τοῦτο δὲ ἐλεγον πειράζοντες αὐτόν, ἵνα ἔχωσι κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ.

(7) Οἱ δὲ Ἰησοῦς κάτω κύψας τῷ δακτύλῳ κατέγραφεν εἰς τὴν γῆν.

(8) Ὡς δὲ ἐπέμενον ἐρωτῶντες αὐτὸν ἀνέκυψεν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ‘Οἱ ἀναμάρτητος ὑμῶν πρῶτος ἐπ’ αὐτὴν τὸν λίθον βαλέτω’ καὶ πάλιν κάτω κύψας ἔγραφεν εἰς τὴν γῆν.

(9) Οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἔξηρχοντο εἰς καθ’ εἷς, ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, καὶ κατελείφθη μόνος ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἐν μέσῳ οὗσα.

(10) Ἀνακύψας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῇ ‘Γύναι, πυῦ εἰσίν; οὐδεὶς σε κατέκρινει;’

(11) Ἡ δὲ εἶπεν ‘Οὐδείς, κύριε.’ Εἶπε δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ‘Οὐδὲ ἐγώ σε κατακρινῶ· πορεύου καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦτον μηκέτι ἀμάρτανε.’

* Matthew (xxi. 17) says that on the evening after the entry into Jerusalem Jesus ‘went out of the city to Bethany and lodged there,’ and subsequent passages imply that the lodging was not

2. *And at dawn he came again into the Temple, † and all the people came to him, and ‡ having sat down he taught them.

3. And the § scribes and the Pharisees bring || a woman taken up for adultery:

merely temporary. The same with Mark (xi. 11). But Luke (xxi. 37, quoted above, and xxii. 39, ‘and went as he was wont to the mount of [the] Olives’) is the only evangelist who vaguely mentions this mountain, and not Bethany, as the lodging-place of Jesus at night.

* There are two close parallels to this verse in the writings of Luke. The first is Luke xxi. 38, ‘And all the people came at dawn [A. V. early in the morning] to him in the Temple, for to hear him’: *came at dawn* is expressed in the Greek by a single word ὥρηπιζε, the verb of ὥρηπον ‘dawn.’ The second is Acts v. 21, ‘they entered into the Temple toward the dawn [A. V. early in the morning] and taught’: here the word used is again ὥρηπον.

It is remarkable that, putting aside this fragment, no N. T. writing, except those of Luke, contains the word ὥρηπον or any of its kin: in addition to ὥρηπον and ὥρηπιζειν Luke also has ὥρηπινός (xxiv. 22). Matthew, Mark, and John always use πρωῒ or πρωῒα, Luke never.

† From here to the end of the verse is left out by seven cursives, including several of the best (e.g. Cod. 16 and Cod. 39). But as six of these read at the beginning of the next verse καὶ προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ the omission may arise from the copyist glancing accidentally from one καὶ to another two lines below it. D omits ‘and having sat down he taught them,’ but the copyist may have confounded this sentence (καὶ—αὐτοῖς) with the one before (καὶ—αὐτόν).

‡ As the Rabbis taught sitting, so, very often at least, did Jesus. See Matt. v. 1 (‘and when he had sat down (A. V. when he was set) his disciples CAME UNTO HIM, and he opened his mouth and taught them’); xiii. 1, 2; xv. 29; (xxiv. 3?); xxvi. 55 (‘I sat daily with you teaching IN THE TEMPLE’); Mark iv. 1; ix. 35; Luke v. 3; John vi. 3. It is Matthew who is most fond of specifying this attitude.

§ Matthew has *scribes and Pharisees* 6 times, Luke 3 times, and Luke and Mark have each *Pharisees and scribes* once.

|| D has a very likely-looking reading—‘a woman taken for sin’ (*ἐπὶ ἀμαρτίᾳ γυναικα τιλημένην*)—which recalls at once Papias’s ‘woman accused of many sins,’ the ‘adulterous and sinful generation’

4. And having placed her in the midst they said to him ¶ ‘Teacher, this woman hath been taken up in adultery, in the very act;

5. ‘And in the law Moses commanded us ** to stone such : †† what therefor dost thou say?’

6. And this they said §§ trying him, §§ that they may have whereby to accuse him.

7. But Jesus having bent down kept

of Mark viii. 38, and the woman ‘which was a sinner’ of Luke vii.
37. It is however without support.

¶ It is a great pity that the A. V. obscures the meaning of the original by invariably giving the ambiguous ‘Master’ as its translation of *διδάσκαλος*.

** This particular mode of death is not definitely prescribed in the law for any form of adultery except that in which a woman ‘betrothed unto an husband’ is guilty : see Deut. xxii. 23–4. It might however be inferred from Deut. xxii. 22, compared with the foregoing and following verse, that a *married* woman committing adultery was also to be killed by stoning.

It is not likely that they had any thought of really stoning this woman. They might not put to death without leave from the Roman governor, who would hardly give it in such cases as this.

†† D reads ‘but what dost thou say now?’

‡‡ Matthew four times represents the Jews as trying (A. V. always ‘tempting’) Jesus (xvi. 1, xix. 3, xxii. 18, 35), Mark thrice (viii. 11, x. 2, xii. 15), Luke twice (x. 25, xi. 16).

§§ Cf. Luke vi. 7, *ἴνα εὑρωσι κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ* ‘that they may find whereby to accuse him,’ and Matt. xii. 10, Mark iii. 2, ‘that they may accuse him.’

If he answered that they ought to stone her they might accuse him to Pilate of counseling disobedience to his authority, if that they ought not to stone her, they might accuse him to the people of counseling violation of the law.

D leaves out this verse, but reads (4) thus, ‘And having placed her in the midst the priests say, trying him, that they may have accusation of him (*κατηγορίαν αὐτοῦ*), Teacher &c.’ D however stands alone, except that there is a fair, but still insufficient, amount of authority for the addition of the single word ‘trying’ in (4).

* writing down with his finger upon the ground.

8. But as they continued asking him he unbent and said to them 'Let the † sinless one of you first cast against her the stone.' And having bent down again he kept writing upon the ground.

9. But they having heard went out one by one, beginning from the elder ones, and Jesus was left alone, and the woman in the midst.

10. And Jesus having unbent said to her '‡ Mistress, where are they? Hath none condemned thee?'

11. And she said 'None, § sir.' And Jesus said 'Neither || will I condemn thee: go, and from this time no longer sin.]

* Or 'drawing,' another meaning of *καταγράφειν*.

† Perhaps with reference to the special sin in question; see above.

The person to be stoned was thrown down by one of the two chief witnesses from an erection of twice the height of a man. If he was killed by the fall, the actual stoning was omitted. If not, after he had been turned on his back the other chief witness dashed a stone on to his breast, and if this did not kill him the rest of the bystanders stoned him. So this punishment is described in the Talmud, *Sanhed.* vi. 4.

‡ Γύναι, a term of courtesy, used 5 times by John, twice by Luke, and once by Matthew.

§ This or 'master' is of course the natural rendering of *κύριος*, the common N. T. form of deferential address, used by servants to their masters (Matt. xiii. 27, xviii. 26, xxv. 20, 22, 24, Luke xiii. 8, xiv. 22, xix. 16, 18, 20, 25), sons to their fathers (Matt. xxi. 30), the Jewish leaders to Pilate (Matt. xxvii. 63), strangers to Philip (John xii. 21), and Mary of Magdala to a gardener (John xx. 15).

|| The difference in the Greek between 'do I condemn' and 'will I condemn' is merely one of accent—*κατακρίνω* and *κατακρίνω*—and the great majority of MSS. during the first few centuries were written without accents. But, as far as MSS. and versions are of avail in such a case, half the uncials, a large number of cursive, and the Old Latin and Vulgate favour the future, which, fancying it a little the better, I therefor adopt.

¶ 23. *Matt. xxiii. 35.* *Zacharias son of Joiada.*

Luke xi. 51.

(Nazarene.)

** 24. *Matt. xxv. 14-* *The Gospel which comes to us in Hebrew*
 30. *characters has directed the threat not against*
Luke xix. 11-27.

¶ Jerome, *Comm. in Matt. xxiii. 35*, In Evangelio quo utuntur Nazareni pro filio Barachiae filium Ioiadae reperimus scriptum—‘In the Gospel which the Nazarenes use we find “son of Joiada” written for “son of Barachias.”’

No Zacharias son of Barachias is known except the minor prophet of that name. There is no Jewish tradition that he died a violent death, and there is not the slightest doubt that the person referred to is the ‘Zechariah the son of Jehoiada’ of 2 Chron. xxiv. 20, 21, who actually was stoned in the court of the priests, between the altar of burnt offerings and the Temple itself, and whose death forms the subject of one of the wildest Talmudic legends. As the murder of Abel comes first in the Old Testament so in the Jewish arrangement of the books the murder of the son of Jehoiada came last.

The words ‘son of Barachias’ in *Matt. xxiii.* are indeed left out by Κ and Eusebius, but are kept by VACD, the Latin versions, the Thebaic, the Peshitta, by Irenaeus, and by Origen; the Curetonian Syriac, which is deficient here, probably contained them also, for it adds them to *Luke xi. 51*. Thus the testimony both of numbers and antiquity compels us to keep the words, and to account for them as best we can.

It is next to impossible that the original reading was simply ‘Zacharias.’ No authority previous to the 4th cent. omits the words ‘son of Barachias.’ And the name ‘Zacharias’ of itself so naturally suggests the minor prophet that a copyist who believed him to be the person intended would scarcely think it needful to indicate him more closely by adding ‘son of Barachias.’

On the other hand it seems most improbable that this glaring mistake should be due to the Jewish writer himself.

I believe that the Gospel according to the Hebrews has kept the original reading, and that the passage passed through three different forms:—(1) *Zacharias son of Jehoiada*—so the original; (2) *Zacharias son of Barachias*—so a very early copyist (or the translator if the Greek Matthew be a translation), knowing only the minor prophet, and correcting, as he thought, the mistake; (3) *Zacharias* by itself—so some later copyists, correcting the real mistake of No. 2.

** Eusebius, *Theophania* (the Greek fragments in Migne’s

*the hider, but against the * abandoned liver.
For it has included three servants, one
† which devoured the substance with harlots
and flute-women, and one which multiplied,
and one which hid the talent : then that one
was ‡ accepted, one only blamed, and one shut
up in prison.*

§25. Matt. xxvi. 17,

18.

Mark xiv. 12.

Luke xxii. 15.

(*Ebonite.*)

1. . . . ‘Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee the passover to eat?’

2. . . . ‘Have I desired with desire to eat this flesh the passover with you?’

edition of Eusebius, iv. 155), Τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἥκον Ἐβραϊκοῖς χαρακτῆρσιν Εναγγέλιον τὴν ἀπειλὴν οὐ κατὰ τοῦ ἀποκρύψαντος ἐπῆγεν ἀλλὰ κατὰ τοῦ ἀσώτως ἔζηκότος. Τρεῖς γὰρ δούλους περιεἶχε, τὸν μὲν καταφαγόντα τὴν ὑπαρκίν μετὰ πορνῶν καὶ αὐλήτριδων, τὸν δὲ πολλαπλασιάσατα, τὸν δὲ κατακρύψαντα τὸ τάλαντον· εἴτα τὸν μὲν ἀποδεχθῆναι, τὸν δὲ μεμφθῆνα μόνον, τὸν δὲ συγκλεισθῆναι δεσμωτηρίῳ.

* Cf. Luke xv. 14 (of the Prodigal Son), ζῶν ἀσώτως· ‘in abandoned living.’ We cannot tell how far Eusebius is summarizing the parable in language of his own or how far he has kept any of the phrases of the original.

† Cf. Luke xv. 30 (of the Prodigal Son), ὁ καταφαγών σου τὸν βίον μετὰ πορνῶν ‘which hath devoured thy living with harlots.’

‡ Or ‘received’—a phrase common in Matt. and Luke, but particularly Luke.

§ Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. 22, καὶ ἐποίησαν τὸν μαθητὰς μὲν λέγοντας ‘Ποῦ θέλεις ἐτοιμάσωμέν σοι τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν’; καὶ αὐτὸν δῆθεν λέγοντα ‘Μή ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα κρέας τούτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ’ ὑμῶν ;’—‘And they have made the disciples say “Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover?” and him to say “Have I desired with desire to eat this flesh the passover with you?”’ Epiphanius proceeds, ‘Αντὶ τοῦ γὰρ εἰπεῖν ‘Ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα’ προσέθεντο τὸ Μή ἐπίθυμημα Αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐπιγράψαντες τὸ Κρέας ἔαντον ἐπλάνησαν, ράδιουργήσαντες καὶ εἰπόντες Μή ἐπ. &c. ‘For instead of saying “I have desired with desire” they have added the adverb μὴ But they, having introduced the word *Flesh*, deceived themselves and fraudulently said “Have I desired &c.?”’ See also *Addenda*.

The first question, ‘Where wilt thou &c.? ’ is the same with that in Matt. xxvi. 17. The second, ‘Have I desired &c.? ’ is very near to Luke xxii. 15, ‘With desire I have desired to eat this passover

[? originally ‘With desire I have desired to eat this (omitting flesh the ?) passover with you.’]

26. Matt. xxvi. 74. Mark xiv. 71. (Nazarene?)	And he denied and swore and cursed.
¶ 27. Matt. xxvii. 16. Mark xv. 7. Luke xxiii. 18. John xviii. 40. (Nazarene.)	** The son of a master [of them ? who had been condemned on account of sedition and murder ?].

with you before I suffer’ (*Ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν*). Epiphanius believed that they had tampered with the words reported by Luke in order to make Jesus express the same aversion from eating flesh which they themselves entertained. We are strongly justified in suspecting that they did so (see notes on Fr. 5 and Fr. 33), and I have therefor put in brackets what may have been the original reading. I have only to add that the charge however probable cannot be proved.

|| Tischendorf’s Codex A, on the margin of Matt. xxvi. 74, Τὸ Ιουδαϊκόν: ‘καὶ ἡρώσατο καὶ ὢμοσεν καὶ κατηράσατο’—‘The Jewish: “and he &c.”’

¶ Jerome, *Comm. in Matt. xxvii. 16*, ‘Iste in Evangelio quod scribitur iuxta Hebraeos filius magistri eorum interpretatur, qui propter seditionem et homicidium fuerat condemnatus’—‘In the Gospel which is inscribed according to the Hebrews he is interpreted the son of a master of them—who had been condemned on account of sedition and murder.’

It is difficult to know how much of this is quoted from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Hilgenfeld excludes ‘of them’ but includes ‘who—murder.’ The words ‘of them’ seem to be Jerome’s own, and that suggests that the following words are his also. Moreover ‘interpreted’ points to ‘the son of a master’ (=Bar Rabban or Bar Abba) as being the only words quoted from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, nor would Jerome have any need to quote from it a statement that Barabbas ‘had been condemned on account of sedition and murder,’ when Luke xxiii. 19, says that Barabbas ‘for a certain sedition made in the city, and for murder, was cast into prison.’ I therefor believe that the words out of brackets represent the limit of Jerome’s quotation.

** Taking his name either as *Bar Rabban* ‘son of a Rabbi’ or *Bar Abba* ‘son of a Father.’ The word ‘master’ perhaps favours

*28. Matt. xxvii. 51. *The lintel of the Temple, of immense size, was broken and fell down.*
 Mark xv. 38.
 Luke xxiii. 45.

(*Nazarene.*)

†29. Matt. xxviii. 1. And when the Lord had given his
 (Nazarene.)

the former, but Lightfoot in his *Horae Hebraicae* quotes from the Talmuds *Rabbi Nathan Barabba*, *Rabbi Samuel Barabba*, and *Abba Barabba*—the name *Abba* ‘Father’ being used as a title of spiritual reverence (cf. Matt. xxiii. 9, ‘call no man your father upon the earth’) like *Padre*, *Père*, Father, and the son of such a reverend person being sometimes surnamed *Bar Abba* ‘son of the Father.’ In the N. T. there is next to no authority for the doubled *r*, but the Harklean Syriac (5th cent.) has it in Matt. (? elsewhere) and it is the form found in the *Acta Pilati*.

Be these things as they may, there is no doubt that the name *Barabbas* was rightly treated in the Gospel according to the Hebrews as a mere surname, nor have I any doubt that the reading ‘Jesus Barabbas’ in Matt. xxvii. 16, 17, supplies his real circumcision-name, and I hope to satisfy those who care to pursue this point in *Appendix G*. Does it not seem likely that the Gospel according to the Hebrews, if it explained this man’s surname, also gave his circumcision-name?

* Jerome, *Comm. in Matt. xxvii. 51*, In Evangelio cuius saepe fecimus mentionem, superliminare Templi infinitae magnitudinis fractum esse atque divisum legimus—‘In the Gospel of which we have often made mention we read that the lintel of the Temple, of infinite size, was broken and splintered.’ Again (*Ad Hedyb. viii.*), In Evangelio autem quod Hebraicis litteris scriptum est legimus non velum Templi scissum sed superliminare Templi mirae magnitudinis corruisse—‘In the Gospel, however, which is written in Hebrew letters we read not that the veil of the Temple was rent but that the lintel of the Temple of wondrous size fell down.’

The only particular words of which we can be absolutely certain are ‘lintel of the Temple’: whether the lintel of the Temple itself or a lintel of one of the gateways of the Temple-courts, but the former is the more natural inference from the expression.

† Jerome, *Catal. Script. Eccl.* (under ‘Iacobus’), *Evangelium quoque quod appellatur ‘secundum Hebreos’ . . . post resurrectionem Salvatoris refert (1) Dominus autem quum dedisset sindonem suum servo sacerdotis ivit ad Iacobum et apparuit ei. (2) Iuraverat enim Iacobus se non comedetur panem ab illa hora qua biberat calicem Domini donec videret eum resurgentem a mortuis.*

Rursusque post paululum (3) *Afferte, ait Dominus, mensam et panem.* Statimque additur (4) *Tulit panem et benedixit ac fregit et post dedit Iacobo Iusto et dixit ei 'Frater mi, comedere panem tuum, quia resurrexit Filius Hominis a dormientibus'*—“The Gospel also which is called “according to the Hebrews” . . . after the resurrection of the Saviour relates (1) *And—from the dead.* And again after a little *Bring*, saith the Lord, *a table and bread.* And immediately it is added *He took up—their that sleep.*”

In the N. T. there is no mention of an appearance to James except in 1 Cor. xv. 7, where, having already mentioned appearances to Kephas, to ‘the Twelve,’ and to 500 brethren, Paul says ‘Then was he seen by James, then by all the Apostles’ (“Ἐπειτα ὅφθη Ἰακώβῳ, ἐπειτα τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν.”).

There can be no doubt that this James was not the son of Zebedee (whom Paul never mentions and who had been dead many years) but ‘James’ (Gal. ii. 9, 13) bishop of Jerusalem, called also ‘James the Lord’s brother’ (Gal. i. 19). The words ‘then by all the Apostles’ do not imply that this James was one of the *Twelve*, but only that he was an Apostle (as he is also styled in Gal. i. 19)—a much wider title, given in the N. T. to Paul, Barnabas, and apparently (Rom. xvi. 7) to Andronicus and Junias: see Bishop Lightfoot’s excursus ‘The name and office of an Apostle’ (*Ep. to the Galatians*, 92).

The Gospel according to the Hebrews certainly suggests that the appearance to James was earlier than others to which Paul gives the priority: such difference in the chronological order of incidents is common among the N. T. writers. There is seemingly no other tradition of an appearance to James.

M. Nicolas and Mr. Baring Gould give references for the tradition to Gregory of Tours (latter part of 6th cent.), to the *Historiae Apostolicae* of pseudo-Abdias (6th cent., but based to some extent at least on legends quite as early as the 4th cent.), and to the *Legenda Aurea* of Jacobus de Voragine.

Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Francorum* i. 21) writes ‘James the Apostle is said, when he had seen the Lord now dead on the cross, to have called to witness and sworn that he would never eat bread unless he beheld the Lord rising again. At last on the third day the Lord, returning with triumph from the spoil of Tartarus, showing himself to James saith “Rise, James, eat, for now I am risen from the dead.” This is James the Just, whom they style the brother of the Lord, because he was the son of Joseph, born of another wife’ (Fertur Iacobus Apostolus, cum Dominum iam mortuum vidisset in cruce, detestatum esse atque iurasse numquam se comedetur panem nisi Dominum cerneret resurgentem. Tertia

demum die rediens Dominus, spoliato Tartaro cum triumpho, Iacobo se ostendens ait ‘Surge Iacobe, comedere, quia iam a mortuis resurrexi.’ Hic est Iacobus Iustus, quem fratrem Domini nuncupant, pro eo quod Ioseph fuerit filius, ex alia uxore progenitus).

Mr. Baring Gould (*Lost and Hostile Gospels*, 150) says that Gregory ‘no doubt drew it,’ the story, ‘from St. Jerome.’ This can only be on the supposition that Gregory quoted very roughly from memory, for the words attributed to Jesus differ considerably, while Gregory plainly says that James took this oath after seeing Jesus dead on the cross.

The so-called Abdias (*Hist. Apost.* vi. 1) makes James the brother of Simon the Cananaean and ‘Judas of James.’ Of these three brothers he says ‘James, the younger, was at all times specially dear to Christ the Saviour, and burnt with so great a yearning toward his master in return that when He was crucified he would not take food before that he saw Him rising from the dead, which he minded to have been foretold to him and his brethren by Christ when He was still among the living. Wherefor He chose to appear to him first of all, as also to Mary of Magdala and Peter, that He might strengthen His disciple in faith; and, that he might not bear long hunger, when a honeycomb was offered Him, He invited James likewise to eat it’ (Quorum minor natu Iacobus Christo Salvatori in primis semper dilectus tanto rursus desiderio in magistrum flagrabat ut crucifixo eo cibum capere noluerit priusquam a mortuis resurgentem videret, quod meminerat sibi et fratribus a Christo agente in vivis fuisse praedictum. Quare ei primum omnium ut et Mariae Magdalena et Petro apparere voluit ut discipulum in fide confirmaret: et, ne diutinum ieunium toleraret, favo mellis oblatu ad comedendum, insuper Iacobum invitavit). Mr. Baring Gould’s translation of this passage is very far from accurate, but, as he gives neither the original nor a reference, it may be borrowed. ‘Abdias’ agrees with Gregory in dating James’s oath from the crucifixion, but, unless he is unconsciously blending this story with Luke xxiv. 42, the substitution of the honeycomb shows that he drew his account from some other unknown source.

Jacobus de Voragine (*Legenda Aurea*, lxvii.) tells the story thus:—‘And on Preparation-day, after the Lord was dead, as saith Josephus and Jerome in the book *Of Illustrious Men*, James vowed a vow that he would not eat until he saw the Lord to have risen from the dead. But on the very day of the resurrection, when up to that day James had not tasted food, the Lord appeared to the same James and said to them that were with him ‘Set a

* linen cloth to the † servant of the priest

table and bread," then taking the bread he blessed and gave to James the Just, saying "Rise, my brother, eat; for the Son of Man is risen from the dead" (In Parasceue autem, mortuo Domino, sicut dicit Iosephus et Hieronymus in libro *De Viris Illustribus*, Iacobus votum vovit se non comedeturum donec videret Dominum a mortuis surrexisse. In ipsa autem die resurrectionis, cum usque in diem illam Iacobus non gustasset cibum, eidem Dominus apparuit ac eis qui cum eo erant dixit 'Ponite meusam et panem,' deinde panem accipiens benedixit et dedit Iacobo Iusto, dicens 'Surge, frater mi, comede; quia Filius Hominis a mortuis surrexit.' —Graesse's text, 297).

Mr. Baring Gould tells us that this story passed into the work of De Voragine from that of Gregory of Tours. But he gives neither original nor translation of Gregory or De Voragine, and to the latter not even a reference; it is very doubtful, therefor, whether he had read either account; certainly he had not read both, or he would have seen that De Voragine cannot possibly have copied Gregory (i.) because his account is fuller and nearer to Jerome, (ii.) because he says that the story is found in the *De Viris Illustribus* of Jerome, whom Gregory does not mention.

The allusion to 'Josephus' as one of the authorities for the story is capable of double explanation. The historian Josephus actually does mention the *death* of James the Just, and this may be simply a 'shot' on the part of De Voragine. But the person intended may be the 2nd cent. Christian writer Hegesippus. The name Hegesippus was in his case as in many others merely a Graecized form of his original name Joseph, and the two names were possibly interchanged to some extent, as in the time of De Voragine himself there was current under the name of *Egesippus* a free version of part of *Josephus's Jewish War* with additions from his Antiquities and other sources. Now we know that *Hegesippus* wrote largely about James the Just, and his Memoirs were still in existence at least as late as the 6th cent. It is the more probable that his account of James *did* include this story because we have already seen that he used the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The concurrence of De Voragine with Gregory in the insertion of the word 'Rise' seems to point to the existence of some other authority besides Jerome.

* The 'linen cloth' (Matt. xxvii. 59) in which the body was wrapped by Joseph of Arimathaea.

† 'The servant of the high priest'—not a servant as the A. V. twice has it—is mentioned in Matt. xxvi. 51, Mark xiv. 47, Luke

he went to * James and appeared unto him.

2. For James had † sworn that he would not eat bread from that hour wherein ‡ he had drunk the cup of the Lord until he saw him rising again from the dead.

3. . . . ‘Bring a table and bread.’

4. . . . [And ?] he took up the bread

xxii. 50, John xviii. 10. He had helped in the seizure of Jesus, and had had his right ear cut off with a sword by Simon Peter, but touched and healed by Jesus: his name was Malchus, i.e. Maluch. One must guess in the absence of context that he had been entrusted with the setting of the watch (mentioned by Matt. only) over the tomb, had been witness to some of the phaenomena of the resurrection, and had thrown himself at the feet of Jesus.

* This mention of James the Lord’s brother without anything to distinguish him from James the son of Zebedee shows that this passage *must* have been written *after* the martyrdom of the latter, A.D. 44.

† Cf. the oath of more than 40 men ‘neither to eat nor drink till they had killed Paul’ (Acts xxiii. 12).

‡ According to this reading James was either one and the same with James the son of Alphaeus or else the Last Supper was not confined to the Twelve.

The first supposition accords with the ‘Hieronymian’ theory as to the degree of relation between James and Jesus; but that theory, apart from its extreme improbability, is not known to have been held by any one whomsoever before 382-3 A.D., when Jerome advanced it.

Of the second supposition we can only say that it is *not absolutely contradicted* by the statement in Matt. xxvi. 20 that Jesus sat down ‘with the Twelve,’ and in Luke xx. 14 ‘the Apostles’ is now recognised as the true reading and not ‘the twelve Apostles.’

The oath of James reads as if suggested by the declaration of Jesus that he would drink no more of the fruit of the vine till he drank it with them in the kingdom of God. James might not take the same oath because Jesus bade the rest drink the cup: but he might take an oath against eating bread because the bread of the Last Supper had already been eaten.

Bishop Lightfoot reads ‘wherein the Lord had drunk the cup’

i.e. *Dominus* for *Domini*. He says (*Ep. to the Galatians*, 266) ‘I have adopted the reading “Dominus,” as the Greek translation has *Kύπιος*, and it also suits the context better; for the point of time which we should naturally expect is not the institution of the eucharist but the Lord’s death. Our Lord had more than once spoken of His sufferings under the image of draining the cup (Matt. xx. 22, 23, xxvi. 39, 42, Mark x. 38, 39, xiv. 36, Luke xxii. 42 —comp. *Mart. Polyc.* 14, *ἐν τῷ πορητῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σον*); and he is represented as using this metaphor here.’ He thinks it probable ‘that a transcriber of Jerome carelessly wrote down the familiar phrase “the cup of the Lord.”’

It is true that ‘the point of time which we should naturally expect is not the institution of the eucharist but the Lord’s death,’ and it might have been added that the latter is the point of time actually indicated by Gregory and pseudo-Abdias. They however, as we have seen, either wrote roughly from memory, or followed some other authority, and I have above suggested how the oath may be connected with the supper: at the supper Jesus spoke plainly of his approaching death, and at least immediately after it he is represented in Matt. xxvi. 32 as announcing his resurrection.

Again we should not expect an *historical narrative* to speak of the death of Jesus ‘under the image of draining the cup’: this may be the language of prophecy or rapt devotion, it is not natural to history. In the N. T. the metaphor is only used by Jesus himself, and by him only on two occasions.

[Of course ‘the cup’ can hardly mean ‘the cup’ of the eucharist, if we read *Dominus*, for Matt. xxvi. 27–9, Mark xiv. 23–5, and Luke xxii. 18–19 represent Jesus as refraining from it; nor can it be strained to signify the anodyne mixture offered to him, as to other condemned persons, on the way to execution, since Matt. xxvii. 34 and Mark xv. 23 distinctly state that he refused this mixture.]

But it is on textual grounds that I have the most confidence in rejecting *Dominus*. So far as I can discover, that reading is not known to exist in any Latin MS., and is only supposed by Bishop Lightfoot to have existed at some time in some MS. because the Greek translator has *ὁ Κύπιος* (=*Dominus*) instead of *τοῦ Κυρίου* (=*Domini*). But one need not read much of the Greek translation to see that (i.) it must have been made from a very corrupt Latin MS.; or (ii.) the translator understood Latin very badly; or (iii.) he never looked twice at the sentences he was translating. Only a few lines before, he actually renders *apparuit ei*, ‘appeared to him’ i.e. James, by *ηρούξεν αὐτῷ* ‘opened to him’ as if the Latin had been *aperuit ei*. Such a man’s translation, opposed, as I

and * blessed and broke and afterward gave to James the Just† and said to him ‘My brother, eat thy bread, for the Son of Man is risen from them that sleep.’

‡30. (Matt. xxviii.) And, when he came to §¹ those about
 Luke xxiv. 39, 40.
 (Nazarene.)

presume, to all known MSS. of the original, has next to no authority.* Let me add that Sedulius Scotus, who flourished about the year 800, in a note on 1 Cor. xv. 7 says that the James there mentioned was ‘the son of Alphaeus who took witness that he would not eat bread FROM THE SUPPER OF THE LORD until he saw Christ rising again: AS IS READ IN THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS.’ I have little doubt that Sedulius got this not merely from the Gospel according to the Hebrews (which however would be quite enough), but from Jerome himself, since he wrote *Explanations of Jerome’s Prefaces to the Gospels*, a work still extant. The original of the above passage of Sedulius is *Alphaei filio, qui se testatus est a coena Domini non comesurum panem usquequo videret Christum resurgentem: sicut in Evangelio secundum Hebreos legitur.*

* Blessed not it (as our A. V. wrongly supposes in the similar passages Matt. xxvi. 26 and Luke xxiv. 30), but *God*. Graces both before and after meat were enjoined by the oral law: the words of the former varied with the character of the food, those of the latter with the number of those present. In the *Mishna, Berachoth*, vii. § 3, may be seen many forms of grace after meat: they all begin with the words ‘Let us bless’ or ‘Bless ye.’ From the note of Maimonides to *Berachoth*, vi. § 8, it would seem that the blessing before meat began with the words ‘Blessed be thou O Lord our God’: the *Mishna* itself (*Berachoth*, vi. § 1) tells us that when the food was bread the words ‘who bringest forth bread from the earth’ were inserted.

† Hegesippus (quoted by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 23) says that he was ‘named by all men Just from the times of the Lord even to us’ (οἱ ὄνομασθεὶς ὑπὸ πάντων Δίκαιος ἀπὸ τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου χρόνων μέχρι καὶ ἡμῶν).

‡ Ignatius, *Ep. ad Smyrn.* c. 3, ‘Ἐγὼ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἰλά καὶ πιστεύω ὅντα. Καὶ, ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἤλθεν, ἔφη αὐτοῖς ‘Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με, καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ ἁμαρτινοὶ ἀσώματον.’ Καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτὸν ἥψαντο καὶ ἐπίστευσαν, κρατη-

¹ For note see page 73.

Peter, he said to them ‘Take, feel me, and

θέντες τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ θανάτου κατέφρόνησαν, εὑρέθησαν δὲ ὑπὲρ θάνατον. Μερὺς δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ συνέπιεν ὡς σαρκικός, καίπερ πνευματικῶς ἦγωμένος τῷ Πατρὶ—‘For I both know that he was in the flesh after the resurrection and believe that he is [in it]. And, when he had come to those about Peter, he said to them “Take, feel me, and see that I am not a bodiless devil.” And straightway they touched him and believed, being constrained by his flesh and spirit. Because of this they despised even death, and were found superior to death. And after the resurrection he ate and drank with them as one in the flesh, though spiritually united to the Father.’

Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 36, § 11) says ‘And the same [Ignatius] writing to Smyrnaeans has used sayings from a source unknown to me, proceeding in some such words as these respecting Christ: “When—believed”’ (*Ο δὲ αὐτὸς Σμυρναῖοις γράφων οὐκ οἶδεν ὅποθεν ῥήγοις συγκέχρηται τοιάντα τινα περὶ Χριστοῦ διεξίων*. ‘Εγὼ—ἐπίστενσαν [quoted with the sole variation ἐλήλυθεν for ἤλθει]).

Jerome (*Catal. Script. Eccl.* § 16) says that Ignatius in the above Epistle ‘also puts forth evidence respecting the person of Christ from the Gospel which has been lately translated by me, saying “But I have both seen him in the flesh after the resurrection and believe that he is [in it]. And, when he came to Peter and to those who were with Peter, he said to them ‘Behold, feel and see me that I am not a bodiless devil.’ And straightway they touched him and believed”’ (in qua et de Evangelio quod nuper a me translatum est super persona Christi ponit testimonium, dicens ‘Ego vero et post resurrectionem in carne eum vidi et credo quia sit. Et, quando venit ad Petrum et ad eos qui cum Petro erant, dixit eis “Ecce, palpate et videte me quia non sum daemonium incorporale.” Et statim tetigerunt eum et crediderunt’).

Theodoret (*Inconfusus*, dial. II.—opp. ed. Sirmond. *Par.* 1642, vol. iv. 86) quotes Ignatius by name down to ἐπίστενσαν, ‘believed,’ without variation.

As all students of Ignatius know, there have been long and fierce controversies as to the epistles bearing his name. Bishop Lightfoot in the *Contemporary Review* for Feb. 1875 looks upon it as now certain that Ignatius wrote epistles, and that either the three of the Syriac edition (which does not include that to Smyrnaeans) or the shorter of the two Greek editions (which does) must be taken to be his genuine work: he gives good reasons why the seven epistles of this Greek edition, even if they be spurious, can hardly have been later than the middle of the 2nd cent., and he adds

further reasons showing why, against his former opinions, he has ‘grave and increasing doubts whether, after all, they are not the genuine utterances of Ignatius himself.’ From a note in Zahn’s 1876 edition of Ignatius I find not only that his championship of these Greek letters had converted continental opposition but that on Dec. 16, 1875, Bishop Lightfoot sent him a letter containing the words ‘since I wrote the article on Ignatius I have been more and more impressed with the unity and priority of the seven Epistles, as representing the genuine Ignatius.’ I therefor believe that I am not going too far in assuming that in the judgement of competent critics the genuineness of the Epistle to Smyrnaeans is at last settled.

I now come to the words of Ignatius. If the first sentence is to be rendered as I have rendered it, it is very clumsy Greek : but I am obliged to give up my earlier rendering, ‘For I know and believe that he was in the flesh even after the resurrection,’ on account of the anti-climax, not to say that we should have looked for *αὐτὸν* after *πιστεύω* instead of where it is. Both Jerome (who seems not to have seen any Ignatian epistles but to have merely translated from Eusebius) and the translator whose full Latin version has come down to us seem to have been as much put out as I am, for they both render ‘For I have both seen him in the flesh after the resurrection and believe that he is [in it],’ which, in the absence of any various reading *εἰδον*, is an impossible solecism. Happily this sentence is no part of Ignatius’s quotation.

The extent of the quotation itself is doubtful. It seems to begin at the second sentence, by Ignatius’s saying not ‘For’ but ‘And.’ Does it, however, include the words ‘constrained by his flesh and spirit’? With Eusebius and Theodoret, I think not; but if this view be right it is a pity that Ignatius did not begin a new sentence. Again the reading and translation of these last words are very doubtful. The MS. has the very strange *κραθέντες* ‘having mixed with,’ i.e. come in contact with ‘his flesh and spirit’ (*or*, flesh and *breath*, but that in conjunction with *σὰρξ πνεῦμα* must almost necessarily mean ‘spirit,’ and that *σὰρξ καὶ πνεῦμα* ‘flesh and spirit,’ or body and mind (as we should say) is a favourite phrase with Ignatius). Voss reads *κραηθέντες* ‘constrained by his flesh and spirit,’ and this was clearly the reading, or conjecture, of the Latin translator, who renders ‘convicti.’ The reading or conjecture which is at the root of the Armenian version was clearly *χρηθέντες* and *αιματι*, for Zahn gives its renderings as ‘*sacra cena usi*’ and *αιματι*: to the Syriac translator from whom the Armenian version was made the passage meant ‘using his flesh and blood,’

i.e. making an eucharistic supper. Apart, however, from the fact that we should have looked for *χρώμενοι* rather than *χρηθέντες*, it is hard to believe that the latter would have been altered to the much less common *κραθέντες*, while the converse is likely enough. With only unsatisfactory readings to choose from I felt inclined to read *κρέα θέντες . . . αἰμάτι*, 'setting meat for' the requirements of 'his flesh and blood,' seeing that the parallel passage Luke xxiv. 39, 40, is followed by a request of Jesus for food, which is thereupon given him: but, not to say that the words 'and blood' would seem superfluous, Ignatius immediately goes on to tell us in words taken from Acts x. 41 that Jesus ate and drank after the resurrection. As the least evil I therefor read *κραγθέντες*, out of which (if written *κραθέντες*) the reading of the Greek MS. would easily arise.

Jerome (*Comm. in Isai.*, lib. xviii. *Prol.*) also writes 'For, when the Apostles thought him a spirit, or, according to the Gospel of the Hebrews which the Nazarenes read "a bodiless devil" (*Quum enim Apostoli eum putarent spiritum, vel, iuxta Evangelium quod Hebraeorum lectitant Nazaraei, incorporale daemonium*).'

Origen (*De Princ.*, *Prol.* c. 8, extant only in a Latin translation) says 'But the appellation *ἀσωμάτου*, that is "bodiless," is not only unused and unknown in many other writers, but also in our writings. If, however, any one should wish to quote to us from that little book which is called *the Teaching of Peter*, where the Saviour seems to say to the disciples "I am not a bodiless devil," in the first place he is to be answered that that book is not reckoned among ecclesiastical books, and to be shown that it is a writing neither of Peter's nor of any other person whomsoever who has been inspired by the spirit of God' (*Appellatio autem ἀσωμάτου*, i.e. incorporei, non solum apud multos alios verum etiam apud nostras scripturas est inusitata et incognita. Si vero quis velit nobis proferre ex illo libro qui *Petri Doctrina* appellatur, ubi Salvator videtur ad discipulos dicere 'non sum daemonium incorporeum,' primo respondendum est ei quoniam ille liber inter libros ecclesiasticos non habetur, et ostendendum quia neque Petri est ista [so Zahn rightly for 'ipsa'] scriptura neque alterius cuiusquam qui spiritu Dei fuerit inspiratus).

Zahn (*Ignatius von Antiochien*, 601-2) thinks that Jerome in the passage I first quoted from him wrote hastily, and that the exact words of Ignatius were not to be found in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. He holds it much more likely that Ignatius quoted *the Teaching of Peter*, and possible that he used neither one nor the other, but a third work which had availed itself of the same

oral tradition. He says he has elsewhere shown that Ignatius twice agrees with our Matthew against the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and thinks it hardly conceivable that, considering his position towards Jewish Christendom, he should, if he referred to the Nazarene Gospel at all, do so only once. I cannot find that he has shown the genuine Ignatius in agreement with our Matthew against the Gospel according to the Hebrews more than once—namely, where Ignatius says that Jesus was baptized by John ‘that all righteousness might be fulfilled by him’ (*ἱνα πληρωθῇ πᾶσα δικαιοσύνη ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ*, *Smyrn.* i. 1), Matthew having ‘to fulfil all righteousness’ while the Ebionite Gospel (see Fr. 7) had ‘that all things should be fulfilled.’ On the other hand it is at least worth notice that of Ignatius’s 12 references to a Matthaean text there is not one which is an unmistakeably exact quotation, while the words used differ several times very markedly from our Matthew; and that in his *Epistle to the Ephesians*, xix. 2, Ignatius describes the appearance of the Star of the Nativity thus:—‘A star shone in heaven above all the stars, and its light was unspeakable, and its novelty afforded amazement. And all the rest of the stars, together with sun and moon, became a group to the star, and of itself it made its light exceed them all; and there was confusion as to whence this novel and irregular phænomenon occurred to them’ (*Ἄστρηρ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἐλαμψεν ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς ἀστέρας, καὶ τὸ φῶς αὐτοῦ ἀνεκλάληγον ἦν, καὶ ξενισμὸν παρεῖχεν ἡ καινότης αὐτοῦ. Τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα ἄστρα ἀμά ήλιψε καὶ σελήνη χόρος ἐγένετο τῷ ἀστέρι, αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν ὑπερβάλλων τὸ φῶς αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ πάντα ταραχῆ τε ἦν πόθεν ἡ καινότης ἡ ἀρόμοιος αὐτοῖς*). This can hardly be our Matthew—even our Matthew heightened—and, though the *Protevangelium of James* § 21 tells of ‘an immense star shining among the stars of the heaven and dulling the other stars so that they were not to be seen’ (*ἀστέρα παμμεγέθη λάμψαντα ἐν τοῖς ἄστροις τοῦ οὐράνου καὶ ἀμβλύνοντα τοὺς ἄλλους ἀστέρας ὥστε μὴ φαίνεσθαι αἰνόντις*), yet we cannot trace that book back to within a century and a quarter of Ignatius (if so early), nor does it say anything about the amazing behaviour of the other heavenly bodies. I do not deny that his account of the star *may* be mere tradition, and that all of his other Matthaean references may be references to our Matthew, but I say that there is something substantial to be said for the idea that, if he did use our Matthew in referring to the baptism of Jesus, he also did use a form of the Matthaean Gospel which was not exactly our Matthew. I may add that it would not be one whit more surprising that Ignatius should quote the Nazarene Gospel once only than that knowing Acts, as he shows that he did, he should never once refer to the Gospel according to Luke.

Lastly, if, as I believe and as Zahn also seems to believe, Hilgenfeld is right in identifying (see my Part III. ii. a) the *Teaching of Peter* with the *Preaching of Peter* and that with the *Preaching of Peter and Paul* and that again with the *Preaching of Paul*, we have already (see Fr. 6) seen that it contained evangelic matter in common with the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and the presumption is that if either borrowed from the other it was the *Teaching which borrowed from the Gospel and not vice versa* (see Part III. ii. a).

In no case would I have agreed to set aside the very precise statement of Jerome that a passage substantially the same as that of Ignatius was in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or the presumption (derived from Irenaeus, from Eusebius's statement about Papias, and from the agreement of our Gospel with certain peculiarities of Justin) in favour of the chronological priority of the latter over the *Teaching of Peter*.

It may be added that Jerome has three variations from the text of Ignatius—‘to Peter and to those who were with Peter’ for ‘to those about Peter’; ‘Behold,’ for ‘Take’; and ‘feel and see me.’ Of these the first and third look like mere differences of feeling in translating, and the second may be a mere slip, suggested by *ἴδετε*, ‘see’ or ‘behold,’ a few words later on. It is just possible that Jerome was consciously or unconsciously correcting Ignatius’s quotation by the Gospel according to the Hebrews; but the use of ‘Peter’ and not ‘Simon’ (see Fr. 19 and Fr. 20) or ‘Kephas’ makes this less likely.

From the second of the two passages in Jerome there can be no reasonable doubt that this is the same appearance of Jesus described in Luke xxiv. 36 seqq., and the parallel in v. 39 of that chapter is a close one—‘handle me and see: for a spirit hath not flesh and bones according as ye behold me having’ (*ψηλαφίσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι πνεῦμα σάρκας καὶ ὄστεα οὐκ ἔχει καθὼς ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα*).

§ The phrase which I thus literally render may also mean ‘Peter and those about him.’ In Mark iv. 10, Luke xxii. 49, *οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν*, ‘those about him,’ are distinguished from Jesus himself. In Acts xiii. 13 *οἱ περὶ τὸν Παῦλον* includes Paul, and the same might be said of xxi. 8 but that the words are there rightly left out by editors as spurious. In John xi. 19 Tischendorf reads (with A and the greater number, but much the less *weight*, of authorities) *τὰς περὶ Μάρθαν καὶ Μαριάμ*—‘And many of the Jews came to those [feminine, the women] about Martha and Mary’—and Alford is almost inclined to do the same: the reading certainly seems far less likely than the other to be due to the carelessness or stupidity of a copyist. If the reading be right, then Martha and Mary are

see that I am not a bodiless * devil.' And straightway they touched him and believed.

(*Of very doubtful connexion.*)

†31.

(*Nazarene.*)

Just now my †¹ mother the Holy Spirit

certainly included (see v. 31). And there is no doubt that in the passage before us Peter himself is included.

'Those about Peter' is not necessarily a synonym for 'the Apostles,' though they are comprised in it. According to Luke the appearance was to 'the Eleven and those with them' (*τοὺς Ἐνδέκα καὶ τὸν σὺν αὐτοῖς*, v. 33).

It is worth noticing that in Mark xvi. Codex L gives an alternative ending to the Gospel, which it says 'is current in some quarters' (*φέρεται πον*), beginning thus, 'And all that had been bidden them they told in short to those about Peter' (*Πάντα δὲ τὰ παρηγελμένα τοῖς περὶ τὸν Πέτρον συντόμως ἔξηγειλαν*), referring to the message sent in v. 7 to 'his disciples and Peter' (*τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ*). So too *k* of the Old Latin (Codex Bobbiensis, 4th or 5th cent.), the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, and the Aethiopic.

* All other translations of this passage that I have seen render *δαιμόνιον* 'spirit,' which is doubtless more elegant, but entirely opposed to the usage of the N. T. and Christian writers. There is nothing at all surprising in the expression 'bodiless devil,' for the Jews believed that the devils which possessed the living were sometimes the spirits of dead persons. In the Curetonian Syriac 'devils' is several times given as the translation of *πνεύματα*, 'spirits.'

† Origen (*Comm. in Iohann.* iii. § 63), 'Εάν δὲ προσίτεαί τις τὸ καθ' Ἐβραίους Εὐαγγέλιον, ἐνθα αὐτὸς ὁ Σωτὴρ φησιν "Ἄρτι ἔλαβέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου τὸ Ἀγιον Πνεῦμα ἐν μίᾳ τῶν τριχῶν μου καὶ ἀνήνεγκέ με εἰς τὸ ὄρας τὸ μέγα Ταβáρ—' But if any one admits the Gospel according to the Hebrews, where the Saviour himself says &c.'

He quotes it elsewhere (*Homil. in Ier.* xv.) without the words 'by one of my hairs,' but these are given by Jerome, who also quotes the passage thus far (*Comm. in Mic.* vii. 6—in quo ex persona Salvatoris dicitur 'Modo tulit me mater mea Spiritus Sanctus in uno capillorum meorum'), likewise mentioning that it was put in the mouth of Jesus.

Hilgenfeld says (*Nov. Test. extra Can. Recep.* iv. 23) that this

¹ For note see page 76.

passage was commonly referred to the Temptation, but that Baur (*Manichäisches Religionssystem*, 485) had rightly assigned it to the Transfiguration. On turning to Baur I find that he gets this connexion by fitting together a bit of the Clementine Homilies, a bit of Manichaeism, and a bit of Valentinianism, starting from the assumption that the feminine nature attributed to the Holy Spirit postulates an identity with the Gnostic Sophia. The answer to Baur is not merely that the Fragments contain no trace of sympathy with the Gnosticism of the Clementine Homilies, no Manichaeism, no Valentinianism, but that the words 'my mother, the Holy Spirit' admit of an ideally simple explanation which is at the same time consistent with the severest orthodoxy—an explanation which I mention in my next note and fully justify in Part. III. i. I may add that Mt. Tabor is in no way indicated by the canonical Gospels as the scene of the Transfiguration; in fact their narrative is quite inconsistent with such a supposition, and the mountain undoubtedly owes this traditional honour to its striking physical prominence. Nor do we find it as the Mt. of the Transfiguration even in tradition before the middle of the 4th cent.

My own impulse first was and still is to connect this fragment with the Temptation, which would appear to have taken place somewhere between the Jordan and Nazareth, for Jesus was *returning* (Luke iv. 1), he had come from Nazareth (Mark i. 9), and Nazareth is the first town named (Matt. iv. 13, Luke iv. 16) as visited by him after his return. And this suits the position of Tabor, which does lie between the Jordan and Nazareth. In the next place it is curious that the arrival of Jesus at the scene of the Temptation is ascribed in Matthew and Luke to the personal action of the Holy Spirit, whom the former represents as 'leading' him 'up' and the latter as 'leading' or 'driving' him. One is very strongly induced to think that where our Matthew says Jesus was 'led up' another early account may have had it that he was 'borne up': indeed this *may* have been the meaning of an Aramaic original, ambiguous possibly and therefor misconceived, or softened into 'led up' because by the Spirit was understood the Spirit received into him at the Baptism, and acting from *within* him.

If connected with the Temptation, this passage might possibly have formed part of an account of the speech of Jesus in the synagogue of Nazareth (Luke iv. 16 seqq.) on his return. Or it may have belonged to his answer to Satan in Matt. iv. 7. Adopting the text of Matthew (A. V.) the request of Satan and answer of Jesus would run thus:—'And saith unto him "If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, 'He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at

* took me by one of my hairs and bore me up on to the great mountain † Tabor.

any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.'" Jesus saith unto him "It is written again, 'Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.' Just now my mother the Holy Spirit took me by one of my hairs and bore me up on to the great mountain Tabor.'" Or the order of the last two sentences might be reversed.

This hypothesis probably seems to the reader utterly fantastic and improbable. But let us look at it more closely. Jesus is asked to throw himself down in reliance on the promise of God, to prove that he is Son of God. He replies that we are forbidden to try God in this manner, and adds that he has already experienced the truth of God's promise, since he had just been borne up by a single hair on to Mt. Tabor.

The circumstantial evidence however is not strong enough to warrant our assigning to this fragment any definite place in relation either to the text of Matthew or the life of Jesus : I merely suggest in all fearfulness this connexion for it.

‡ In Hebrew *ruach* 'spirit' is sometimes masculine, though more commonly feminine ; but in Aramaic the corresponding word *rucha* is feminine. Matt. i. 18 and Luke i. 35 assign to the Holy Spirit the chief, and seemingly the sole, agency in the conception of Jesus by Mary. See my remarks on the theology of this fragment in Part III. i.

* Hilgenfeld notes the following analogous passages : (i.) Ezek. viii. 3 (A. V.) 'And he put forth the form of an hand, and took me by a lock of mine head ; and the spirit lifted me up between the earth and the heaven, and brought me in the visions of God to Jerusalem' ; (ii.) Bel and the Dragon, 36 (A. V.) 'Then the angel of the Lord took him by the crown, and bare him by the hair of his head, and through the vehemency of his spirit set him in Babylon over the den' ; (iii.) Acts viii. 39, 40 (A. V.) 'The Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more : and he went on his way rejoicing. But Philip was found at Azotus.' Hilgenfeld rightly observes that the antiquity of this fragment is exalted, rather than (as some thought) detracted from, by the mention of such an incident. Let me add to the passages compared by him 1 Kings xviii. 12 (A. V.) 'And it shall come to pass, as soon as I am gone from thee, that the Spirit of the Lord shall carry thee whither I know not,' and 2 Kings ii. 16 (A. V.) 'lest peradventure the Spirit of the Lord hath taken him up and cast him upon some mountain, or into some valley.'

† About seven miles E. of Nazareth. A mound-shaped height

§ 32.

He that hath marveled shall reign, and
he that hath reigned shall || rest.

¶ 33. Luke xiii. 3?
(Ebionite.)

Unless ye cease from *sacrificing* [spuri-
ous] the** wrath shall not cease from you.

of some 1,000 ft., rising by itself from the plain, and affording a wide and far view. The name seems to mean 'height.'

§ Clement of Alexandria, after citing Plato and the *Traditions of Matthias* as testimonies to the value of wonder in stimulating enquiry, says 'just as in the Gospel according to the Hebrews it is written &c.' (*Strom.* ii. 9—for the Greek see p. 3, note).

Hilgenfeld connects this fragment with Matt. xi. 8, 'Come unto me &c.' The connexion is just possible, but I do not think likely.

|| 'Rest' in this spiritual sense is a term peculiar to Matthew, who uses the noun in xi. 29 and the corresponding verb active in the verse before.

¶ Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxx. 16), Φάσκουσι δὲ καὶ ἐλθόντα, καὶ ὑφη-
γησάμενον (ὡς τὸ παρ' αὐτοῖς Εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει) ὅτι ἥλθεν, καταλῦσαι
τὰς θυσίας, καὶ ἔαν μὴ παύσησθε τοῦ θύειν οὐ παύσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡ
ὄργη—'And they say that he both came, and (as their so-called
Gospel has it) instructed them that he had come, to dissolve the
sacrifices, and "Unless &c."'

It is surely impossible that Jesus ever uttered this threat, and we have already (see notes on Fr. 5 and Fr. 25) found grave cause to suspect the Ebionites of adapting their Gospel to suit their own views. But only the word *sacrificing* needs be spurious.

Hilgenfeld would insert these words in that passage of the Ebionite Gospel which answers to the place occupied by Matt. v. 23, 24, in the canonical Gospel! To me it seems very possible that they were part of a paragraph answering to Luke xiii. 1-3, where Jesus takes for his text the death of 'the Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices.' Our fragment would then answer to Luke xiii. 3 'Nay, I say unto you, but except ye repent, ye shall all in like manner be destroyed.'

** Matthew (iii. 7) and Luke (iii. 7) have each 'the wrath' once for 'the wrath of God,' and Luke also has 'there shall be wrath' (xxi. 23). John has only 'the wrath of God' (once, iii. 36), which the others do not use.



III.

*THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE, AND GENERAL
CONCLUSIONS.*

LET us now estimate the internal evidence afforded by the Fragments as to (i.) the character of this Gospel; (ii.) its relation to other works outside or inside of the canon.

(i.) The Gospel according to the Hebrews shows no approach to the character of the Apocryphal Gospels. Among their foremost features are Mariolatry, miracle-mongering, imaginative elaboration of incidents briefly sketched in the Canonical Gospels, and a free invention of other incidents out of canonical materials. Of the first two there is no trace in the Fragments, and of the third and fourth only a very slight suspicion. The mason's speech, the speech of Jesus to the rich man, and the appearance of Jesus to James, might at first seem to be mere elaborations of canonical incidents. The mason's speech, however, is very brief, and the plain form of address 'Jesus' hardly the most likely for a forger to adopt. The story of the rich man seems to be altogether independent of the canonical versions. The appearance of Jesus to James is told in language not less brief than beautiful, and the Pauline Epistles are not the source from which a Nazarene would be most likely to draw. There is better cause to regard the Preface as a mere compilation (and a very bald one) from canonical data: but we have to remember that it comes to us from an Ebionite copy and not a Nazarene one, and that, while we have good reason to charge the Ebionites with altering and interpolating, no similar evidence exists against the Nazarenes.

And here we come to the question whether the Gospel according to the Hebrews was heretical, or betrays a design to favour any peculiar views.

This must be fully admitted of Epiphanius's Ebionite copy. The first two chapters of Matthew were struck out

from it because they were not to be reconciled with Ebionite theories of the nature of Jesus. Nor can we doubt that the denunciation of sacrifices put into the mouth of Jesus (Fr. 33) is a pure forgery in support of their anti-sacrificial views. His professed *disinclination* (opposed to Luke xxii. 15) to eat ‘this FLESH the passover’ with his disciples looks like a wilful perversion to suit their own strict vegetarianism, and the non-mention of locusts as part of the Baptist’s food becomes in this light very suspicious.

Nothing of this can be charged against Jerome’s Nazarene copy, or, indeed, against the copies quoted by other Fathers. I have argued that Jerome’s copy contained Matt. ii. 5, 15, 23. There are, however, a few of the Nazarene fragments which call for some remark.

In Fr. 6 Jesus, while asserting his sinlessness, is represented as qualifying this assertion with the words ‘except perchance this very thing that I have said is ignorance.’ The question whether Jesus, as man, *was able*, consciously or unconsciously, to sin is, I believe, one which has rarely been discussed, and never been pronounced on by the Church. That his knowledge, as man, increased with his years is said in Luke ii. 52, and in Mark xiii. 32 a certain limitation is assigned to it, such limitation, I may add, being recognised by so orthodox a doctrinal teacher as Canon Liddon (*Bampton Lectures*, 459, seqq.), who quotes on the same side Irenaeus, Cyril, Athanasius, and Gregory Nazianzen.

In Fr. 31 Jesus calls the Holy Spirit his mother, and Hilgenfeld remarks that Fr. 8, in which the Holy Spirit addresses him as ‘my Son,’ is analogous. This is sufficient to prove to M. de Pressensé that ‘we have here that eternal female element which formed part of the primordial duality of the Elkasaites, and which* they likened to the Holy Spirit’ (*Heresy and Christian Doctrine*, 1873 ed. 155). Mr. Baring Gould has similar observations, and says that ‘the words “my mother” are, it can scarcely be doubted, a Gnostic interpolation’ (*Lost and Hostile Gospels*, 130, 131).

* Making the Holy Spirit, however, not the mother of Jesus, but his sister: see Epiphanius, *Haer.* liii. καὶ εἶναι τὸ Ἀγιον Πνεῦμα ἀδελφὴν αὐτοῦ ‘and that the Holy Spirit was his sister.’

Verily he must have a keen eye for heresy who can discover it here. Does not Matt. i. 18 say that Mary ‘was found with child of the Holy Spirit,’ and Matt. i. 20 that ‘that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit’? Does not Luke i. 35 say ‘The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefor also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God’? Is not the word ‘Spirit’ feminine in *Aramaic? And is it then a sign of heresy that Jesus who spoke of the First Person of the Trinity as his Father should be represented as speaking of the Holy Spirit as his Mother? ‘We must not think,’ says †Jerome (writing without any reference to the Gospel according to the Hebrews), ‘that there is sex in the Powers of God, since even the Holy Spirit himself is spoken of according to the peculiarities of the Hebrew language in the feminine gender as *Ruha*; in Greek in the neuter, as τὸ Πνεῦμα; in Latin in the masculine, as *Spiritus*; whence we must understand, when there is discussion about those above, and anything is put in the masculine or feminine, that it is not so much sex that is signified as it is the idiom of the language that is being uttered. Since God himself, invisible and incorruptible, is spoken of in almost every language in the masculine gender, although sex does not apply to him.’ But since Origen, ‡ who himself encountered and denounced

* *Ruach*. In Hebrew *Ruach*, which is sometimes masculine, but generally feminine.

† *Ep. ad Damasum, De Seraphin et Calculo* (Martianay’s ed. iii. 523), ‘Nec putandum sexum esse in Virtutibus Dei, quum etiam ipse Spiritus Sanctus secundum proprietates linguae Hebraeae feminino genere proferatur *Ruha*; Graece neutro τὸ Πνεῦμα; Latine masculino *Spiritus*. Ex quo intelligendum est, quando de superioribus disputatur et masculinum aliquid seu femininum ponitur, non tam sexum significari quam idioma sonare linguae. Siquidem ipse Deus invisibilis et incorruptibilis omnibus pene linguis profertur genere masculino, quum in eum non cadat sexus.’ By ‘Hebrew’ Jerome means Aramaic, as in other places (see p. 1, note). Cf. to the same effect *Comm. in Isai. xl. 11* (lib. xi.), where this fragment is also quoted.

‡ See the extract quoted by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl. vi. 38*) from Origen’s lost Homily on Ps. 82.

Elkesaism, adduces this fragment of the Gospel according to the Hebrews twice, taking the trouble to §justify it at some length, and Jerome also adduces it twice, I need not linger further in its defense.

Fr. 19 is decidedly remarkable. It lays down two propositions respecting the prophets, (1) that they were anointed by the Holy Spirit, (2) that nevertheless ‘utterance of sin’ is found in them.

To those who find in (2) a proof of heresy let me put three questions. Is the expression of sinful feelings ‘utterance of sin’? If so, are feelings sinful which are diametrically opposed to the moral teaching of Jesus? If so, has any ingenuity of commentators || explained the ‘cursing psalms’ of the prophet David (see particularly Ps. cix. 6–20) into harmony with the precepts of Matt. v. 44, and Luke vi. 27–8?

The other proposition, (1) that the prophets were anointed by the Holy Ghost, is important as showing that the Nazarene Gospel was not tinged with that strong aversion to the prophets (later than Joshua) which the Ebionites (Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. § 18) are said to have had. Nor is this the only passage in which the prophets are honourably noticed in the Nazarene Gospel. In Fr. 8 the Holy Spirit is represented as expressing in ‘all the prophets’ a yearning for the coming of Jesus, and in Fr. 20 the prophets are joined with the Law as standards of duty.

These are all the passages in the Nazarene Gospel against which any but the most finikin criticism can be directed. It would be easy to suggest that even these were interpolations, as M. Nicolas (*Études sur les Évangiles Apocryphes*) and Mr. Baring Gould have already done. But I cannot consent to see an interpolation in everything which on first

§ *Hom. in Ioh.* iii. § 63, on the ground that even men who do the will of God are called by Jesus his mother and brethren.

|| ‘The Speaker’s Commentary,’ I observe, practically abandons any such attempt. ‘Is a Christian spirit,’ it asks, ‘to be expected always in the psalms? Would the words of Christ (Matt. v. 43, 44, &c.) have been uttered if the spirit which animated the Jewish people, and was exhibited, not unfrequently, in their annals, had been always that which He came to inculcate?’ (vol. 4, 424).

hearing seems to jar a little with the expressions or tone of thought of the Canonical Gospels.

The Fathers of the Church, while the Gospel according to the Hebrews was yet extant in its entirety, referred to it always with respect, often with reverence: some of them unhesitatingly accepted it as being what tradition affirmed it to be—the work of Matthew—and even those who have not put on record their expression of this opinion have not questioned it. Is such an attitude consistent with the supposition that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was a work of heretical tendencies? This applies with tenfold force to Jerome. After copying it, would he, if he had seen heresy in it, have translated it for public dissemination into both Greek and Latin, and have continued to favour the tradition of its Matthaean authorship?

And Jerome, be it observed, not only quotes all three of these passages without disapprobation; he actually quotes two of them (Fr. 6 and Fr. 8) with approval. But, although Jerome has never been suspected of lenience to heresy, some of us must needs out-Jerome Jerome and demand uniformity where he tolerated variety. The truth is that in all these centuries the familiar moulds have sunk so deep into our own minds that we are maybe a little too ready to reject as spurious any fragment of early extra-canonical literature which does not bear the same exact impress.

We shall better be able to correct this tendency if we imagine for the moment that only three canonical Gospels had come down to us, that the fourth had only been preserved among the Nazarenes, and that only a few fragments of it were left.

Let us suppose that Matthew had been this lost Gospel, and that among the fragments left out of it were ii. 23 ‘that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by [through] the prophets He shall [that he should] be called a Nazarene’; v. 17 ‘Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil’; x. 5, 6, ‘Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not. But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel’; xv. 24 ‘I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel’; xvi. 18, 19 ‘I say also

unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.'

There is no need to look further through Matthew for passages on which, if they came to us as fragments from a Nazarene Gospel, we should not hesitate to fasten charges of heretical tendency. In ii. 23 we should at least see the use of an apocryphal book, even if we did not also perceive an intention to magnify the name of Nazarene. In v. 17, x. 5, 6, and xv. 24 we should find the extremest Judaizing views. And in xvi. 18, 19 we should see an impudent forgery of the ultra-Petrine school of Ebionites, directed, like other of their forgeries, against Paul and Pauline Christians.

Or let us suppose Mark to have been the Nazarene Gospel. From the fact that it began with the Baptism, we should forthwith conclude that it was designed to support the heresy that Jesus was mere man until the divine Christ descended into him in the shape of a dove. And for xiii. 32, 'Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father,' we should have found no sufficient justification.

Similarly, if no account of the conception of Jesus had come to us except as a fragment of a Nazarene Gospel, and had such fragment said, as Matthew and Luke say, that he was conceived of the Holy Spirit, and, as Luke, that this was the reason why he was called the Son of God, should we not denounce this as the wildest heresy? Should we not ask where Jesus referred to the Holy Spirit as his father or mother, whether he did not rather imply that the Holy Spirit proceeded from himself, whether he was not called the Son of God because he was the Son of God the Father—whether in fine we were not confronted either by rank Elkesianism or by a heresy which confounded the Holy Spirit with God the Father?

I might isolate many more passages from the Canonical Gospels to show in what sort of spirit we should be tempted

to regard any one of those Gospels if it came to us only in fragments from an out of the way body of Christians not entering into relations with the Church at large and associated in our minds by local, national, and to a great extent ceremonial affinity with the anti-Catholic sect of the Ebionites proper.

So little has been written about the Nazarenes, and so few people, I imagine, have had occasion to study their history or doctrines, that I shall here quote what is said of them by two ecclesiastical historians of such eminence and unquestioned orthodoxy as Neander and the late Dean Mansel.

‘After the destruction of Jerusalem,’ writes Mansel (*Gnostic Heresies*, 125), ‘this Jewish-Christian Church continued to exist in Pella and the neighbouring region beyond the Jordan, to which it had withdrawn during the siege,* and where it appears to have remained until the reign of Hadrian when, after the revolt and destruction of Bar-Cochab and his followers, the Roman city of Ælia Capitolina was founded on the ruins of the ancient Jerusalem.† In that city no Jew was permitted to dwell, and the prohibition would naturally extend to those Christians of Jewish origin who had not renounced the customs of their forefathers.‡ This circumstance led to a division in the Church, the Gentile members of it, together with the less rigid Jewish Christians, establishing

* ‘Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 5.’

† ‘Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 6. In chapter 5 Eusebius gives a list of fifteen bishops of Jerusalem of Jewish race, down to the time of the revolt in Hadrian’s reign; but these, though nominally bishops of Jerusalem, could hardly have resided in that city, which remained uninhabited except by a Roman garrison in its towers (Josephus, *B. J.* vii. 1), till Barcochab seized it and attempted to rebuild the temple. Neander (*Ch. Hist.* i. p. 475) says that the Church *is said* to have returned to Jerusalem, but gives no authority for the statement, and seems to doubt its truth (see p. 476). It is possible, however, as Milman supposes (*Hist. of Jews*, ii. p. 431), that some sort of rude town may have grown up on the wreck of the city; and, if so, it is possible that the Judaizing Christians may have gone back to Pella after the edict of Hadrian. Cf. Neander, *l. c.* p. 476; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 304.’

‡ ‘Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 16. Cf. Neander, *Ch. Hist.* i. p. 475; Ritschl, *Entstehung der Altk. Kirche*, p. 257.’

themselves at Jerusalem under a succession of bishops of Gentile birth, § while the strict Judaizers remained at Pella, where after the departure of their brethren they would naturally enforce their own rites with greater strictness than ever. Under these circumstances the Jewish Christian settlement at Pella, retaining its old appellations of Nazarene and Ebionite, which from terms of reproach had probably become among themselves titles of honour, seems to have gradually relapsed still more into Judaism, retaining a certain kind of acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah, but ceasing at last to acknowledge His Deity and pre-existence. These heretical views would naturally be developed into more consistency by some than by others, and thus gave rise to the two divisions of the Ebionites, of whom the less heterodox, or Nazarenes, were probably the earlier in point of time.' || Speaking of the Gospel according to the Hebrews he presently says (126) 'In the fourth century, if not earlier, there were two different recensions of it, one of which omitted, while the other retained, the first two chapters of St. Matthew. The former was used by the Ebionites proper, who denied the supernatural birth of our Lord. The latter was accepted by the more orthodox Nazarenes.' ¶

Let us now turn to Neander, the chief of ecclesiastical historians, who, curiously enough, was a Jew by birth and up to his eighteenth year by religion also. After dismissing the Ebionites, he says (*History of the Christian Religion and Church*, Eng. trans. ii. 18) 'In Jerome, on the contrary, under the name of *Nazarene* (the original name given to all Christians by the Jews, see *Acts xxiv. 5*), we find the descendants of those Jewish Christians of a **genuine evangelic disposition, who would not allow the existence of any contradiction between the apostles, the same people of whom we found the last trace in Justin Martyr (see above). They pointedly combated the regulations and the ceremonial

§ 'Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 6.'

|| 'Cf. Dorner, *Person of Christ*, i. p. 191 (Eng. Tr.); Neander, *Ch. Hist.* i. p. 476.'

¶ 'Epiphan. *Haer.* xxix. 9, xxx. 14. Cf. Bleek, *Einl.* p. 105; Mosheim, *De Rebus Chr. ante Const.* 328.'

** The italics are Neander's or his translator Mr. Rose's—not mine.

worship of the Pharisees; and, while they themselves observed the ceremonial law, they did not force it on the heathen. They acknowledged the apostle Paul as a teacher of Divine wisdom, whom God had peculiarly chosen for his instrument, for the purpose of bringing the tidings of salvation to the heathen nations. They lamented the unbelief of their own people, and longed for the time when they also should be converted to the Lord whom they had crucified, and renounce all their idols. Then nothing would be done by the power of man, but every thing which Satan set up in opposition to the kingdom of God would fall down by the power of God, and all who had hitherto pleased themselves, in the fancy of their own wisdom, would be converted to the Lord. They thought that they found this promise in the prophecies of Isaiah (xxxii. 7, 8*). The conclusion which we are entitled to draw clearly from all this is, that from the very times of the apostles various sorts of Jewish Christians spread themselves abroad, which people have been led into confusing with each other by the common names which were given to them.'

These are the people, heirs of the church of Peter and of James, from whom we have the most relics of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and whose history and character, I venture to think, furnish warrant in its favour rather than against it.

(ii.) We have now to inquire into the relations, if any, between the Gospel according to the Hebrews and other works (a) uncanonical, or (b) canonical.

(a) The uncanonical book with which it has most (two fragments) in common is that which was called † sometimes

* ‘Hieronymi commentar. in Iessiam, ed. Martianay, t. iii. p. 79, 83, 250, 261.’

† The identity of the works cited under the first two names is inferred from the fact that Lactantius (iv. 21) says ‘The Master revealed to them all those things which Peter and Paul preached at Rome, and that preaching, written for remembrance, has survived’ (Magister aperuit illis omnia quae Petrus et Paulus Romae praedicaverunt, et ea praedicatio in memoriam scripta permansit); and that the author of the treatise *De Rebaptismate*, the only person

the Preaching of Peter, sometimes *the Preaching of Paul*, sometimes *the Teaching of Peter*, and which professed to give an account of the joint preaching of those two apostles at Rome. It is first quoted by Heracleon, in a fragment of his preserved by Origen. The date of Heracleon has not been exactly determined, but it is fair to put him at 170 A.D.—he may in fact have been a little older or younger, but was at any rate contemporary with Hegesippus, the first writer whom we certainly know to have quoted the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

The substance of Fr. 6 and Fr. 30 was, as we have seen, contained in this work, but if either borrowed from the other the author of *the Preaching of Peter* must have borrowed from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. His book was what its name implies—a didactic work, not an evangelic record, and the overwhelming presumption is that any evangelic incidents which it shares with early Gospels were borrowed from and not by them.

‡ *The Gospel according to Peter* is said by Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* ii. 2 §) to have been used by the Nazarenes. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* vi. 12) preserves an account of it from

who cites a *Preaching of Paul*, says that it represents Peter and Paul as meeting for the first time in Rome.

That the *Teaching of Peter* was the same as the *Preaching of Peter* is inferred from the fact that neither Origen (who uses both names) nor any one else has stated that there were two distinct works with these respective titles.

If the three titles represent three works, or if the two *Preachings* are one work and the *Teaching* another, any suspicion of borrowing that attached to the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* would be further weakened. For in the first place there would no longer be the accumulative evidence of two Fragments agreeing with the same book; for it was in the *Preaching of Paul* that the substance of Fr. 6, and in the *Teaching of Peter* that the substance of Fr. 30 was to be found. And, as regards Fr. 6, if the *Preaching of Paul* be not the same as that of Peter, there is no evidence for its existence before the 4th cent.: while, as regards Fr. 30, there is no evidence for the existence of a *Teaching of Peter*, if it be not the same as his *Preaching*, before about 225 A.D.

‡ Hilgenfeld, *N. T. extra Can. Rec.* iv. 39–41.

§ Τῷ καλούμενῳ κατὰ Πέτρον Εὐαγγελίῳ κεχρημένοι.

the pen of Serapion, Bp. of Antioch 191–213 A.D. Writing to the church of Rhossus in Cilicia, Serapion says * ‘For we, brethren, receive both Peter and the other Apostles † as we do Christ, but the writings falsely inscribed with their name we refuse from experience, knowing that such have not been delivered to us. For I when I was with you supposed that all were inclined to a right faith, and, not having gone through the Gospel produced by them in Peter’s name, I said “If this is all that seems to give you discouragement, let it be read.” But now, having learnt that their mind began to lurk in a certain heresy ‡ from what I had said, I will hasten to come again to you; so that, brethren, look for me speedily.’ Then follows a very corrupt sentence which may mean § ‘And you, brethren, after understanding of what

* Ἡμεῖς γάρ, ἀδελφοί, καὶ Πέτρον καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Ἀποστόλους ἀπο-
δεχόμεθα ὡς Χριστόν, τὰ δὲ ὄντας αὐτῶν ψευδεπίγραφα ὡς ἔμπειροι
παραιτούμεθα, γινώσκοντες ὅτι τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐ παρελάβομεν. Ἐγὼ γάρ
γενόμενος παρ’ ὑμῖν ὑπερίσουν τοὺς πάντας ὄρθη πίστει προσφέρεσθαι,
καὶ μὴ διελθὼν τὸ ὑπ’ αὐτῶν προφερόμενον ὄντας Πέτρον Εὐαγγέλιον
εἴπον ὅτι ‘εἰ τοῦτο ἔστι μόνον τὸ δοκοῦν ὑμῖν παρέχειν μικροψυχίαν,
ἀναγινωσκέσθω.’ Νῦν δὲ μαθῶν ὅτι αἱρέσει τινὶ ὁ νοῦς αὐτῶν ἐνεφώλευεν
ἔκ τῶν λεχθέντων μοι σπουδάσω πάλιν γενέσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ὥστε, ἀδελ-
φοί, προσδοκάτε με ἐν τάχει. Ἡμεῖς δέ, ἀδελφοί, καταλαβόμενοι ὅποιας
ἡν αἱρέσεως ὁ Μαρκιανός, καὶ ἔαντφ ἡγαντιοῦτο μὴ τοῶν ἀ ἐλάτει μαθή-
σεοθε ἐξ ὧν ὑμῖν ἐγράφη. Ἐδυνήθημεν γάρ παρ’ ἄλλων τῶν ἀσκησάν-
των αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, τουτέστι τῶν διαδόχων τῶν καταρξαμένων
αὐτοῦ, οὓς Δοκητὰς καλοῦμεν—τὰ γάρ φρονήματα τὰ πλείονα ἐκείνων
ἔστι τῆς διδασκαλίας—χρησάμενος παρ’ αὐτῶν διελθεῖν καὶ εὑρεῖν τὰ μὲν
πλείονα τού ὄρθου λόγου τοῦ Σωτῆρος, τινὰ δὲ προσδιεσταλμένα, ἀ καὶ
ὑπετάξαμεν ὑμῖν. Hilgenfeld makes no remark on the difficulties of
this text.

† There is no need to change this, but in a passage part of which is certainly corrupt one naturally suspects a peculiar expression like ὡς Χριστόν ‘as we do Christ.’ Is it possible that we should read either ὡς Χριστοῦ ‘as Christ’s’ or ὡς χρηστοῖ—ἀποδεχόμεθα ὡς χρηστοῖ ‘we receive in right-mindedness’ forming an antithesis to ὡς ἔμπειροι παραιτούμεθα ‘we refuse from experience’?

‡ Does he merely mean that the cheerfulness of his permission led them to set greater store by a heretical Gospel, or can it be that they fancied the words τὸ δοκοῦν in his answer were intended to convey covert approbation of its *Doketic* principles?

§ I conjecture ‘Ὑμεῖς for Ἡμεῖς, ὡς before καὶ, and probably ὑμῖν

heresy Marcianus was, will learn from what has been written for you [or ? by us] how he contradicted even himself, not knowing what he was saying.' Then Serapion says 'For from others of those who affected this same Gospel, that is from the successors of those who first employed it, whom we call Doketists (for the opinions are mainly of the school of those men), from them we borrowed it and were able to go through it and to find the larger part of its contents of the right word of the Saviour, but some things superadded, which we have also subjoined for your benefit.'

|| As to who the otherwise unknown Marcianus was, I can only conjecture, with the utmost diffidence, that the Gospel according to Peter professed to have been taken down from Peter's dictation—or translated from Peter's autograph—by a person of that name, whom Serapion believed to be the real author of the Gospel. The name is curiously like that of ¶ Mark (Marcus) whom early tradition represents as having been Peter's interpreter and as having written his Gospel from notes of what he had heard Peter say.**

for *ιμῖν*. All three of the old readings look very like mistakes of the ear made by a person copying from dictation (maybe from the dictation of Eusebius himself to his clerk). 'Υμεῖς and 'Ημεῖς, ήμῖν and *ιμῖν*, were hardly to be distinguished by ear and are perpetually confounded in N. T. MSS. In modern Greek there is also the only slightest distinction of sound between *o* and *ω*, the confusion of which is likewise common in N. T. MSS., and it was easy for a tired copyist to lose the sound of *ως* in the last syllable -ός of the preceding word, especially if (as also in modern Greek) the aspirate in *ως* was not sounded. I since find that Rufinus, who translated Eusebius about 408 A.D., renders as if he read *ως καὶ*.

|| See however *Addenda*.

¶ As are *Lucanus*, *Lucianus*, *Leucius*—the names of the assumed author or authors of apocryphal books—to *Luke*.

** In relation to this subject it is instructive to compare two passages in *Supernatural Religion*. In vol. i. 419 (4th ed.) the author aims at showing the antiquity of the *Gospel according to Peter* and the probability of Justin's having referred to it: he therefore says 'We learn from Eusebius that Serapion, who became Bishop of Antioch about A.D. 190, composed a book on the "Gospel according to Peter" (*περὶ τοῦ λεγομένου κατὰ Πέτρον εὐαγγελίου*)

Eusebius himself (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 3) mentions the Gospel according to Peter among several works attributed to Peter (including the Preaching) which ‘we do not know to have been ever reckoned by tradition among catholic writings, since no ecclesiastical writer, ancient or modern, has employed their testimony.’* In this, however, he is wrong, for Origen refers to it (*Hom. in Matt.* x. 17) as asserting that the brethren of Jesus were sons of Joseph by a former wife, a view of which he proceeds to declare himself a supporter.

It is unlucky that we have no further information about this Gospel and that no specimen has been preserved of what Serapion considered its Doketic interpolations—especially as we know, from charges of forging certain various readings brought against Marcion (see Prof. Westcott in Smith’s *Bible Dictionary*, ii. 507), that such suspicions might go too far. But, whatever its character, and whether or not it was used by the Nazarenes, there is not the remotest trace of any connexion between it and the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

(b) We are now free to examine the relation (if any) of the Gospel according to the Hebrews to books inside the Canon of the New Testament. The only satisfactory way of conducting this examination is to analyse the internal

which he found in circulation in his diocese.’ But in vol. ii. 167 he writes ‘The fact that Serapion in the third century allowed the Gospel of Peter to be used in the church of Rhossus shows at the same time the consideration in which it was held and the incompleteness of the canonical position of the New Testament writings.’ Note that when he wishes to exalt an uncanonical book it is ‘Serapion, who became bishop of Antioch about A.D. 190,’ but when his object is to show ‘the incompleteness of the canonical position of the New Testament writings’ it is ‘Serapion in the third century’: of course it is likely that the Gospel according to Peter was brought to Serapion at his *first* visitation of the church of Rhossus, and also that this visitation took place at any rate during the first nine years of his bishopric.

* Οὐδὲ ὅλως ἐν καθολικαῖς ἵσμεν παραξέδυμένα, ὅτι μήτε ἀρχαίων μήτε τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τις ἐκκλησιαστικὸς συγγραφεὺς ταῖς ἐξ αὐτῶν συνεχρήσατο μαρτυρίαις.

evidence afforded by each fragment in turn, and to tabulate and sum up our results, after which, but not before, we shall be entitled to draw conclusions.

Fr. 1 (Ebionite) has no evangelical parallel. It looks, as I have already said, like ‘a mere compilation (and a very bald one) from canonical data.’ The object of it—to attach to the Gospel the stamp of direct apostolic authority—is in any case suspicious. It agrees with the three Synoptics when it mentions the call of twelve apostles, the fact that Simon had a house at Capharnaum, and, if Levi and Matthew be one (which I greatly doubt), the call of Matthew (otherwise with Matthew only). With Matthew and John alone it calls Iscariot ‘*the Iscariot*’ (unless the article be due to Epiphanius). With Mark alone it says that Jesus entered a house after ordaining the Twelve, and with him alone (probably) or with him and Matthew it gives the name of one of them as Thaddaeus. With Luke alone it states the age of Jesus, calls the sea of Galilee a ‘*lake*’ and Simon the Cananaean ‘*the Zealot*’: but in Aramaic one word represents *sea* and *lake*, and *Cananaean* means *Zealot*, so that the Aramaic original of the fragment (if it had one) would not show these two peculiarities of Luke’s Gospel. Lastly, with John alone it attaches to the sea of Galilee the name of the town ‘*Tiberias*.’ It is clear, therefor, that the author of this fragment has not borrowed specially from any one of our Gospels: but he is much to be suspected of having borrowed impartially from at least two.

Fr. 2 (Nazarene) is quoted by Jerome as = Matt. ii. 5, exactly as it stands in the Curetonian Syriac and other authorities: Bethlehem is called ‘Bethlehem of Judaea’ in Matthew only, and is not mentioned in Mark.

Fr. 3 (Nazarene) = Matt. ii. 15, verbatim: there is no parallel in the other Gospels.

Fr. 4 (Nazarene) = Matt. ii. 23, verbatim: there is no parallel in the other Gospels.

Fr. 5 (Ebionite) agrees generally in substance with the three Synoptics. V. (1) in the shortest version bears a slight trace of connexion with Matt. iii. 1 or its archetype, the two longer versions a much stronger one. The longest version also introduces mention, peculiar to Luke, of the parentage

of John the Baptist and the priesthood of ‘*Caïphas*.’ Both the longer versions contain the phrase ‘*baptism of repentance*,’ found in Mark and Luke once, and twice in Acts, and one of them speaks of the ‘*river*’ Jordan, as does Mark i. 5. Again the words ‘*began baptizing*’ (*ἐγένετο βαπτίζων*) agree with the reading in Mark i. 4 which, though probably wrong, is that of the great majority of MSS. and versions. V. (2) = Matt. iii. 5, and Mark i. 5: the mention of ‘*Pharisees*’ = Matt. iii. 7, John i. 24, and ‘*all Jerusalem*’ is peculiar to Matthew, Mark having ‘*all they of Jerusalem*.’ V. (3) = Matt. iii. 4 and Mark i. 6, with the omission, possibly due to Ebionite vegetarianism, of ‘*locusts*.’ The prophecy inserted in Matt. iii. 3, Mark iii. 3, Luke iii. 4, John i. 23 is omitted, also possibly out of hostility to the prophets: yet there is no such reason why Matt. iii. 2 should have been left out, except maybe to agree with the form of Mark—an unwise aim in a professedly Matthaean Gospel.

It is difficult to make much out of all this. The outline of the passage according to the shortest copies agrees closely with Mark, vv. (1) (2) (3) exactly corresponding in order with Mark i. 4, 5, 6. V. (2) is much more like Matthew, from whom the beginning of v. (1) also seems to be abridged. Of Luke and John there is no separate trace in the shortest copies. In the longer version v. (1) contains traces of connexion with Matthew (*one*), Mark (*one*), Luke (*one*), and a phrase found in Mark and Luke’s writings only.

Altogether we must, I think, take the fragment as allied more nearly to Matthew than to our other Gospels, and must assign its omissions and additions to dogmatic dishonesty on the part of the Ebionites, recognising the certainty that they used Luke or a similar Gospel, and the full possibility that they used Mark, for their purpose.

Fr. 6 (Nazarene) has no evangelical parallel. In v. (1) ‘*behold*’ is a word specially characteristic of Matthew and Luke; the title ‘*Lord*’ used in speaking of Jesus is almost though not quite peculiar to Luke and John; ‘*for remission of sins*’ is applied to John’s baptism by Mark and Luke only, though Matthew says that those baptized confessed their sins; ‘*remission of sins*’ occurs eight times in the writings of Luke against seven times in all the other books of the N. T.

In v. (2) Jesus disclaiming sin reminds us of John viii. 46, and the admission of a possible limitation of his knowledge recalls Mark xiii. 32.

Altogether the verbal analysis suggests relations to Luke.

Fr. 7 (Ebionite) runs parallel to Matt. iii. 13–17, Mark i. 9–11, and Luke iii. 21, 22 (John i. 32, 33 being analogous but not parallel). V. (1) agrees very nearly with Luke iii. 21. V. (2) is far nearer to Matt. iii. 16 than to the other accounts, with the noticeable exception of the words '*in shape of a dove*', which recall Luke. The important preposition '*into*' has also the strongest support (D and all the Latin versions) in Luke, but is also read by D and some other authorities in both Mark and Matthew. In v. (3) the words of the voice agree exactly with Luke alone, and the second utterance, '*I have this day begotten thee*', answers to Justin's form '*Thou art my Son : I have this day begotten thee*', which is also read in Luke by D; the Old Latin, Clement of Alexandria, &c. &c. V. (4) gives the story of the light in Jordan which is inserted by two Old Latin MSS. in Matt. iii. 15, and which Justin mentions not only as a fact but, if we accept Tischendorf's very slight emendation, as a fact related by the Apostles in their memoirs. The question '*Who art thou, [Lord] ?*' following a voice from heaven and a great light, suggests that the language of Luke in his three accounts of the conversion of Paul was influenced by this or some similar account of the Baptism, or else that this account of the Baptism was influenced by Luke's account of the conversion of Paul—which seems less likely. V. (5) in repeating the voice gives the same words as Matthew. Vv. (6) and (7) answer to Matt. iii. 14, 15, but are placed after the Baptism instead of before it.

Here we have the most unmistakeable connexion both with Matthew and Luke, and with them only. Moreover, that form of the evangelical text with which the fragment has most in common is one which, whether correct or not, was certainly current as early as the first half of the second century.

Are we then to regard this fragment as a compilation from Matthew and Luke? It does indeed come to us from

an Ebionite source, and we have seen good reason to doubt the honesty of the Ebionite text; in Fr. 5, moreover, we detected in some of the Ebionite copies signs that Luke, or at least some kindred work to Luke, had been laid under contribution. But, on the other hand, none of the suspected Ebionite corruptions seem to have been made without an object, whereas it is difficult to see what end the reviser of a Matthaean ground-text had to gain by adopting Luke iii. 21 in preference to Matt. iii. 13, by transposing Matt. iii. 14, 15, or by introducing the question of John and the last voice from heaven. It was indeed necessary to transpose Matt. iii. 14, 15 if John's question and the heavenly answer were inserted, but *why* insert them?

Fr. 8 (Nazarene) has no evangelic parallel, but the resting of the Spirit (with the supernatural light of Fr. 7) may just possibly be alluded to in 1 Pet. iv. 14, while '*rested upon him*' is the reading of the Curetonian Syriac in Matt. iii. 16. A single phrase, '*that reignest for ever*', has its analogy in Luke.

Fr. 9 (Nazarene?) = Matt. iv. 5 and Luke iv. 9, speaking of '*Jerusalem*' with the latter and not '*the holy city*' with the former. A Nazarene reviser of the canonical Matthew would surely have kept '*the holy city*'.

Fr. 10 (Nazarene) seems to = Matt. v. 22, and no other passage. The metaphorical use of '*brother*' is specially characteristic of Matthew, as regards the Gospels.

Fr. 11 (Nazarene) does not = any passage in the Gospels. The word *ἀγαπή*, which would represent *caritas* in Greek, is specially characteristic of John's Gospel, which also contains several injunctions to the disciples to love *each other*, but the tenor of the fragment is far more suggestive of Matthew (particularly) or Luke.

Fr. 12 (Nazarene) = Matt. vi. 11, Luke xi. 3, only.

Fr. 13 (Ebionite) = Matt. x. 25, only.

Fr. 14 is quoted by Eusebius in reference to Matt. x. 34, Luke xii. 51. It has no evangelic parallel. '*Whom my Father in the heavens hath given me*' recalls John xvii. 6, '*the men which thou gavest me out of the world : thine they were, and thou gavest them me*', spoken by Jesus to the '*Father*', and *ib.* 9, '*I pray not for the world, but for them which*

thou hast given me.' But '*Father in the heavens*' points very strongly to Matthew, who is also more abundant than his fellow Evangelists in precepts of good will to others.

Fr. 15 (Nazarene) is an additional detail to a story told in Matt. xii. 9 seqq., Mark iii. 1 seqq., Luke vi. 6 seqq. *Victum 'sustenance'* may answer to *βίον*, a word used never by Matthew or John, once by Mark, but four times by Luke; but it may also correspond to *τροφήν*. The simple address '*Jesus*' is only found in Luke xxiii. 42 (best reading); Jesus is addressed by name (with additional epithets) twice more in Luke, and thrice in Mark, but not at all in John or Matthew (according to the best reading of Matt. ix. 12). '*Shamefully beg for food*' recalls Luke xvi. 3, 'to beg I am ashamed.' Altogether we have reason to suspect relations with Luke.

Fr. 16 (Ebionite) = Matt. xii. 47-50, Mark iii. 32-5, Luke viii. 20, 21. V. (1) agrees most nearly with Matthew, Luke not having the word 'behold,' and Mark introducing the sisters of Jesus. V. (2) is a shade nearer to Mark than to Matthew; Luke omits the question. V. (3) does not point to any, but is a little nearer to Matthew than to the others. Altogether there is most trace of connexion with Matthew.

Fr. 17 = Matt. xv. 24 (verbatim), only.

Fr. 18 (Nazarene?) = Matt. xvi. 17, only.

Fr. 19 (Nazarene) = Matt. xviii. 21, 22, Luke xvii. 3, 4, and is much nearer the former. In v. (1) forgiveness is made dependent on the contrition of the offender, as in Luke. In v. (2) Peter is introduced as questioning Jesus on the subject: Luke omits all mention of him. Such a style as '*Simon his disciple*' is not found in our Gospels, but the word '*disciple*' is much more frequent in Matthew than in Luke (most frequent of all in John), while on the other hand Peter is spoken of or to as plain '*Simon*' only once in Matthew, but seven times in Mark and eight times in Luke (once only in John). In Acts (four times) the second name Peter is always added, as in 2 Pet. i. 1. In v. (3) the number '*seventy times seven*' is peculiar to Matthew; the latter part of the verse is not contained in either evangelist, but '*anointed by the Holy Spirit*' savours of Luke.

Fr. 20 (Nazarene) = with wide differences Matt. xix. 16–24, Mark x. 17–25, Luke xviii. 18–25. V. (1) shows that a conversation with some other rich man had gone before it, and suggests that the canonical accounts may have blended these two conversations. The two rich men, as Hilgenfeld says, recall Matthew's two demoniacs (viii. 28) and two blind men (xx. 30), where Mark and Luke only mention one; while, on the other hand, he speaks of only one angel at the sepulchre, but Luke and John of two. The absence of the epithet 'Good' in addressing Jesus agrees with the best reading of Matt. xix. 16. 'Live' in the sense of 'have eternal life' is only found in Luke x. 28 among the Synoptics; there are more instances in John: but 'life' in the sense of 'eternal life' never occurs in Luke, but four times in Matthew, twice in Mark, and of course very often in John. 'Man' in v. (2) is a form of address peculiar to Luke, the conjunction of the prophets with the law as a code of life is equally peculiar to Matthew. V. (4) is a little nearer to Luke, who however omits 'Go,' than to the others. V. (5) retains the commandment '*Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*,' omitted by Mark and Luke. 'Sons of Abraham' = 'son of Abraham' Luke xix. 9 and 'daughter of Abraham,' xiii. 16, while 'seed of Abraham' occurs twice in John and 'children of Abraham' once. On 'Simon his disciple,' v. (6), see my remarks on the last fragment; 'sitting by him' is a detail recalling Matthew. Altogether that part of the fragment which corresponds with the canonical accounts agrees best with Matthew; so do two peculiarities of matter, but the peculiarities of style recall Luke and John.

Fr. 21 (Nazarene) = Matt. xxi. 9 and Mark xi. 10 verbatim; substantial parallels are also afforded by Luke xix. 38 and John xii. 13.

Fr. 22 (Nazarene?) may not be *verbally* represented by John vii. 53–viii. 11. But, if it is, v. (1) strikingly agrees with Luke xxi. 37 (substantially confirmed by Matthew), while v. (2) offers a still more remarkable parallel to Luke xxi. 38; the word 'dawn,' *ōpθρον*, is also peculiar to Luke; but 'having sat down' is much more a trait of Matthew. In v. (3) 'the scribes and the Pharisees' is also rather suggestive of Matthew. 'Teacher,' v. (4), is a little more common in

Mark and Luke. ‘*Trying him*,’ v. (6), is more frequent in Matthew and Mark than in Luke, but the *form* of the words ‘*that they may have whereby to accuse him*’ is more like Luke. In v. (10) ‘*Mistress*’ is specially Johannine (five times); Luke has it twice to Matthew’s once.

Fr. 23 (Nazarene) = Matt. xxiii. 35, Luke xi. 51, but the latter passage does not mention Zacharias’s father. Here the Greek Matthew contains a palpable error, but the Nazarene Gospel keeps what must almost certainly have been the original reading.

Fr. 24 = Matt. xxv. 14–30, Luke xix. 11–27, with wide variation from both. We do not know that Eusebius has kept any part of the original wording; but with this reservation we may observe that ‘*the abandoned liver*’ and ‘*which devoured the substance with harlots*’ are very like phrases in Luke xv. 14, 30; and that ‘*accepted*’ or ‘*received*’ is a term common in both Matt. and Luke, but particularly the latter.

Fr. 25 (Ebionite) is very remarkable. V. (1) = Matt. xxvi. 17, Mark xiv. 12, and is nearer to the former. Luke does not mention the question, but makes Jesus say to Peter and John ‘*Go and prepare us the passover, that we may eat*’ (xxii. 8). V. (2) undoubtedly corresponds to Luke xxii. 15, ‘*With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer*,’ but ‘*before I suffer*’ is omitted, ‘*this passover*’ becomes ‘*this flesh the passover*,’ and the affirmation of Jesus is turned into a question expecting a negative answer. We have seen strong cause to suspect the verse of having been corrupted by the Ebionites, but the question remains an open one whether it was borrowed from Luke. Supposing that the verse formed no part of their original Gospel, it is quite easy to understand why the Ebionites should have thus borrowed it. The fact that Jesus ate of the paschal lamb might be turned against Ebionite vegetarianism: they therefor wished to represent that he did so with reluctance. This, however, was contradicted by Luke xxii. 15. What more simple than to introduce into Luke xxii. 15 the slight change needed to produce an entirely opposite sense, and then to incorporate it into their Gospel, retorting upon Luke any charge of corruption which might be brought against them by the orthodox? This is very

possible, but it is equally possible that the verse in Luke's form may have been contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews before the Ebionites corrupted it.

Fr. 26 (Nazarene?) = Matt. xxvi. 74, Mark xiv. 71, with little variation. The incident of which it is a detail is also related by Luke and John.

Fr. 27 (Nazarene) is part of a verse corresponding to Matt. xxvii. 16, Mark xv. 7, Luke xiii. 18, John xviii. 40. As the name 'Barabbas' is here distinctly treated as a surname, the circumcision-name may also have been given, in which case there is a probability of connexion with that form of Matthew's text which assigned to Barabbas the circumcision-name 'Jesus.' If the words 'who had been condemned on account of sedition and murder' are part of Jerome's quotation—which, however, I do not believe—they are closely parallel to Luke xiii. 19.

Fr. 28 (Nazarene) differs from Matt. xxvii. 51, Mark xv. 38, Luke xiii. 45, but is part of a verse answering to them.

Fr. 29 (Nazarene) has no evangelic parallel, but almost undoubtedly represents the story alluded to by Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 7. V. (1) alludes to a fact mentioned by all four evangelists, that the dead body of Jesus was wrapped in linen: all of them, moreover, speak of 'the' servant of the high-priest in connexion with the apprehension of Jesus.

Fr. 30 (Nazarene) = Luke xxiv. 39, substantially.

Fr. 31 (Nazarene) has no evangelic parallel. The relation assigned to Jesus and the Holy Spirit reminds us somewhat of Matt. i. 18 and Luke i. 35.

Fr. 32 has no evangelic parallel. The spiritual use of the word 'rest' is confined to Matthew.

Fr. 33 (Ebionite) has no evangelic parallel, but suggests that the Ebionite Gospel contained a passage corresponding to Luke xiii. 1-3, in which this fragment occupied the place of Luke xiii. 3. 'The wrath' suggests Luke or Matthew.

Now let us tabulate our results:—

(i.) Out of 33 Fragments the following 10 are entirely independent of the canonical narratives—nos. 1, 6, 8, 11, 14, 22, 29, 31, 32, 33. Of these 5 come to us from a Nazarene source (6, 8, 11, 29, 31), 2 (both very suspicious) from an

Ebionite source (1, 33), and 3 from a source undetermined (14, 22, 32)—one of which (22) is probably Nazarene.

So large a proportion of peculiarities is remarkable if we compare the Gospel according to the Hebrews with Matthew or Mark, but not if we compare it with Luke, who has about 82 sections in common with them, but 37 peculiar to himself.

The fragments above specified do not, taken together, give convincing evidence of a connexion with any of the canonical Gospels. But of the 5 Nazarene Fragments 2 (6, 8) present verbal analogies to {Luke, and 2 others (11, 31) some little substantial analogies to both Matthew and Luke. Of the 2 Ebionite Fragments 1 suggests relation to Luke (33), but one word at the least is spurious ; the other (1) is almost equally suspicious, and may be a compound from our Gospels. Of the 3 neutral fragments, Fr. 14 seems to have been connected with Matthew and Luke, and is analogous to passages in Matthew and John; Fr. 22 (if we have the right text) most nearly approaches Luke, and next to him Matthew ; and Fr. 32 suggests Matthew.

First Deduction. The Gospel according to the Hebrews contained matter entirely independent of the canonical narratives. The proportion of this matter would be nearly $\frac{1}{3}$, if it were the same throughout the Gospel as in the Fragments.

Second Deduction. The independent fragments show parallels of thought and expression to the canonical narratives, more especially those of Matthew and Luke.

(ii.) Out of the remaining 23 Fragments 2 only (Nazarene, 21 and 27) are parallel to passages contained in all four of our Gospels, or to passages contained in Johr. The former fragment is so very short that we cannot tell to which evangelist it came nearest, but there is reason to suspect that it was akin to one form of Matthew's text, and if the words included by Hilgenfeld should be admitted—which is most doubtful—a decided parallel to Luke is established. The other fragment agrees verbatim with Matthew and Mark, only partially with Luke and John.

Six fragments (5, 7, 15, 16, 20, 28) are parallel to Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Of these 5, 7, 16 are Ebionite,

the other three Nazarene. Fr. 5 in its shortest form is apparently allied to Matthew: in its longer forms it almost proves that the Ebionites were capable of interpolating from Luke or documents used by or derived from him, and suggests the use of Mark also. Fr. 7 is closely allied to both Matthew and Luke, and especially to second century texts of these Gospels: it also contains an extraordinary parallel to an incident thrice told in Acts. In Fr. 16 there is most likeness to Matthew. In the Nazarene Fr. 15, which has no corresponding verse in our Gospels, there is a likeness to Luke's phraseology. Fr. 20, where it runs parallel to the canonical accounts, agrees best with Matthew, but in style is nearer to Luke and John. Fr. 28 yields no evidence.

Third Deduction. There is no evidence that the Gospel according to the Hebrews contained matter peculiar to or derived from John.

Fourth Deduction. It contained matter substantially common to the three Synoptists, the passages including this matter forming about $\frac{1}{4}$ of the Fragments.

Fifth Deduction. Such passages taken altogether show special likeness to Matthew and Luke.

One fragment (26, Nazarene) is parallel to Matthew and Mark only, and is equally near to each. Half of another fragment (25, Ebionite) is also parallel to these two alone, and is nearer to Matthew.

Sixth Deduction. There is no evidence that the Gospel according to the Hebrews contained any matter peculiar to, or derived from, Mark, except, maybe, in the interpolated Ebionite Fr. 5.

Five fragments (9, 12, 19, 23, 24) are parallel to Matthew and Luke only. All these are Nazarene, except the last—of which the source is undetermined. Fr. 9 is nearer to Luke, but no stress can be laid on the one word ‘*Jerusalem*.’ Fr. 12 is identical with both. Fr. 19 is nearer to Matthew, but with distinct points of resemblance to Luke. Fr. 23 shows greater affinity to Matthew, and is free from the mistake of the Greek. Fr. 24 points decidedly to Luke if Eusebius has kept the wording of his original.

Seventh Deduction. The Gospel according to the Hebrews contained matter peculiar to Matthew and Luke, the passages

containing such matter forming between $\frac{1}{6}$ and $\frac{1}{7}$ of the Fragments.

Eighth Deduction. Such matter, if borrowed at all, was not borrowed from either exclusively.

Seven fragments (2, 3, 4, 10, 13, 17, 18) are parallel to Matthew only. Of these 2, 3, 4, 10 are from a Nazarene source; so probably is 18: 13 is Ebionite; 17 is of undetermined origin. Fr. 10 agrees substantially with Matthew and has one of his favourite words. The others agree very closely indeed with Matthew, most of them verbatim.

Ninth Deduction. The Gospel according to the Hebrews contained matter peculiar to Matthew, the passages containing such matter forming a little more than $\frac{1}{3}$ of the Fragments.

One fragment (30, Nazarene) is parallel to Luke only. So is one half (suspicious) of another (25, Ebionite).

Tenth Deduction. The Gospel according to the Hebrews contained matter peculiar to Luke, the passages containing such matter forming hardly $\frac{1}{20}$ of the Fragments.

We arrive then at a Gospel (*a*) in great part independent of the extant text of our Gospels, and (*b*) showing no signs of relationship to Mark or John, but (*c*) bearing a very marked affinity to Matthew, and (*d*) a less constant but still obvious affinity to Luke.

We have now to enquire whether the matter allied to Matthew and Luke was derived from the Greek Matthew (or an Aramaic Matthew of which the Greek was only a translation) and Luke.

Those who hold this theory are compelled, by the great preponderance of Matthew in the Fragments, supplemented by the unanimity of tradition with regard to the Matthaean character of the Gospel, to suppose that our present Matthew formed the groundwork of it, and that the non-Matthaean portions were merely incorporated into that groundwork.

We shall, however, find that this theory, which for shortness I call the 'compilation-theory,' fails to explain many of the phaenomena of the Fragments. In Fr. 5, which seems to be allied to Matthew, it does not very well solve the omission of Matt. iii. 2, the transposition of Matt. iii. 5, or

the alteration of that verse and Matt. iii. 1. In Fr. 7 we fail to see why Matt. iii. 13 was discarded in favour of Luke iii. 21 ; why John's question and the second heavenly voice are brought in ; why the position of Matt. iii. 14, 15 is altered. It was, indeed, needful to shift these last verses if John's question and the heavenly answer were inserted, but to what end is this insertion ? Again, as regards Luke, the light on Jordan and John's question are so strikingly like the light at Paul's conversion and *his* question that there seems to be something more than mere coincidence between the accounts. It appears, however, infinitely more probable that the language of Luke should have been influenced by his recollection of a similar *previous* incident in the life of Jesus than that the supposed compiler of the Gospel according to the Hebrews should have copied Luke's description of a similar *subsequent* incident in the life of Paul. In Fr. 9 why is Matthew's 'holy city' (which in a Jewish Gospel we should certainly expect to be kept) altered to 'Jerusalem' ? If Fr. 10 answer textually, as it does in substance, to Matt. v. 22, why the change of form ? if, on the other hand, the Gospel according to the Hebrews contained another passage corresponding textually to Matt. v. 22, why was Fr. 10, a mere repetition of it in substance, inserted at all ? In Fr. 16 we might conjecture that the omission of the words 'desiring to speak with thee' was due to Epiphanius's compressed relation of the incident, but why the departure from Matthew xii. 50 ? In Fr. 19 why does the conversation on forgiveness begin with a remark from Jesus instead of (as in Matthew) a question from Peter ? And, if Fr. 30 be borrowed from Luke, why is not Luke's text followed ?

To these questions the compilation-theory cannot, I think, give answers : I might have asked more, but I have excluded all to which even any sort of answer might be given.

Nor does the compilation-theory explain why, as we find from the Stichometry of Nikephorus (see *Addenda*), the Gospel according to the Hebrews was shorter than Luke or Matthew. We know from the Fragments that our supposed compiler sometimes recounted incidents at greater length than either, and that he incorporated a large amount of

independent matter. We should have expected his compilation to be longer than either; why is it shorter? He must have omitted considerable portions of his groundwork; yet we see that he did not object to miracles, or parables, or other discourses—what are we to suppose that he omitted, and what were his motives for omission?

The compilation-theory must therefore, I think, be dismissed, and we must seek some other explanation of the agreement of the Gospel according to the Hebrews with Matthew and Luke.

Some one may possibly think that he finds that explanation in the counter hypothesis that Matthew and Luke have borrowed from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. But, if so, why have they omitted matter for the most part entirely unobjectionable and some of it (e.g. Fr. 8, Fr. 11, and Fr. 29) quite equal in beauty to anything which they retained? Why did they leave out those additional details which the Gospel according to the Hebrews often supplies to their narratives? Why does one evangelist sometimes adopt its version, while the other passes it by for a less minute and picturesque account from another source? This theory, like the former, must therefore be abandoned.

It is true that by supposing Matthew, Luke, and the Gospel according to the Hebrews (or at least two of them) to have undergone a long series of alterations and additions, we might manipulate the existing facts so as to suit either of the above theories—or indeed any theory whatsoever. This style of criticism has, moreover, some distinguished precedents in its favour. But for my own part I prefer to wait, if need be, for the solution of a difficulty rather than to evolve from my own consciousness a number of various editions of which absolutely no record can be found.

I now come to my own hypothesis. And, since so little is known, so much debated, respecting the sources and composition of the canonical Gospels, let me say beforehand that it requires only one assumption, namely—that whenever, wherever, and by whomsoever the canonical Gospel according to Matthew was written, however varied may have been the oral or documentary sources from which it was composed or compiled, and whether it was first written in Greek or

Aramaic, it shows the special handiwork of one particular man. This much, I think, no one will dispute, and if I agree not to assume that he was an Apostle, or that his name really *was* Matthew, perhaps I may be allowed for convenience's sake to call him 'Matthew.'

My hypothesis, then, is that Matthew wrote *at different times* the canonical Gospel and the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or at least that large part of the latter which runs parallel to the former.

The hypothesis will not appear absurd to anyone who reads it by the light of everyday facts in authorship. Modern writers put forth new editions of their works, often adding much, omitting much, varying much: sometimes even a book is entirely rewritten. There is no reason why we should refuse to believe that ancient authors exercised the same liberty. Bishop Lightfoot, indeed, suggests (*Revision*, 29) that Luke wrote two slightly different copies of his Gospel; and, whether this be so or not, it is at least certain that the Ascension as told in Acts is a complete rewriting of the same event as told in his Gospel.

And in the case of Matthew many peculiar considerations render such alterations both possible and probable. If he had dreamt that 1800 years later a very partially Christianized world and a very divided Christianity would have no other knowledge of the life of Jesus than what they had gathered from himself and three of his contemporaries, he would have written something more than a sketch which (to compare it with a modern biography) fills only about thirty-five ordinary octavo pages. Matthew expected that in his own lifetime, or at least his own generation, all the tribes of the earth should see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, that angels with a great sound of a trumpet should gather the elect from the four winds, and that heaven and earth should pass away. Meanwhile there were many witnesses of the life of Jesus still living and communicating the history of his life to the converted and the unconverted alike. It was an age too in which 'many took in hand' to put that history in writing; nor were their narratives fantastic apocrypha—they were accounts of 'the things most surely believed' among Chris-

tians, derived from ‘eyewitnesses and ministers of the word,’ and the other evangelist who tells us this wrote not to supersede but to confirm them. Moreover a missionary preacher can nearly always spread what he has to say wider and faster than a writer; and in the days of Aramaic and uncial Greek manuscripts this was still more true than it is in these days of printing-presses. And so, probably, Matthew never thought of composing a full biography that should last for all time, but merely wrote a brief sketch, perhaps for the information of some private friend, as did Luke, or at the request of some particular community. By and by, possibly, another friend or another community desired an account from him: perchance he had kept no copy of the former one, or only rough notes—hence omissions, variations, additions: perchance also he purposely varied the contents somewhat, whether of his own fancy, or according to the character of the persons for whom he was writing, or with reference to the contents of other Gospels.

But, some one may say, we are told * that Mark’s Gospel is a collection of notes of Peter’s lectures. May not Matthew have been merely an oral teacher, and may not the Gospel bearing his name be a collection of notes made by one or more of his hearers,† and not actually *written* by him at all? Then, I reply, the Gospel according to the Hebrews might be another such collection made by other hearers, and probably at another time.

The relationship between the Gospel according to the Hebrews and Luke is less hard of definition. We have nothing like the same quantity or quality of coincidence, material or verbal, to account for. Casual agreement of detail might be explained by supposing that either of the two writers was influenced by *recollections* of the other: for we have seen that neither can have written with the other’s work actually before him. We have strong reason to suspect such recollection in Luke’s accounts of the conversion of Paul, and it is also worth notice that Paul, who seems to

* By Papias (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39).

† Papias expressly refers to Matthew as a source of oral tradition (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 38). The passage is quoted and translated in *Appendix B*.

have got his version of the Last Supper from his companion Luke, mentions an appearance of Jesus to James after the Resurrection. It is, however, quite needless to suppose that either Luke or the writer of the Gospel according to the Hebrews had ever seen the other's work. Each may have derived the corresponding matter from oral tradition or from other of the 'many' written Gospels in circulation. Coincidences of vocabulary admit the same easy explanation on either hypothesis. All we can safely say is that many details and phrases in the Gospel according to the Hebrews which are not found in the Greek Matthew are at least in their ultimate source coeval with Luke.

I have not yet touched the difficult question of priority between the canonical Matthew and the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The fact that the latter twice speaks of 'the Lord' is perhaps a sign of its later date: see note on Fr. 6. If, however, the term 'Lord' be used in its strict original sense 'master,' that would suggest that the Gospel was written by a personal follower of Jesus. A later date is also possibly indicated by the fresh incidents and additional details which it supplies. It may, indeed, be urged that Matthew's memory would be more complete when he wrote his first work: on the other hand, the longer he lived the more his recollection would be revived, or the fuller information he would gain, by the publication of other men's Gospels, or the communication of their oral tradition. Again the fact that the Greek Gospel does not contain a few words and conspicuous phrases found in the Aramaic Gospel seems to afford a slight additional argument for the priority of the former: yet, if the Gospel according to the Hebrews were recovered entire, we might find peculiarities in the canonical Gospel to balance these. Applying the test of length, we are inclined to regard the Aramaic Gospel as the earlier, it being the shorter. Nevertheless, wherever we can compare its relation of events with that of the Greek we find it fuller and are led to suspect that it was shorter only through the omission of parables or long discourses. In this case its preference for incident would tend to show a later date: the further men got from the days of Jesus the more they demanded that information about the facts of his life which

was gradually passing out of their reach—I have little doubt that if two lost but genuine Gospels were at this date recovered, the one homiletic, the other narrative, the most devotional Christian would set greater store by the latter.

Altogether, then, I think there is a slight amount of presumption in favour of the priority of the canonical Gospel, but some of the counter arguments given above, together with the less stereotyped character of the Aramaic Gospel, disincline me from expressing a decided opinion.

The question whether the Greek Gospel is translated from an Aramaic original remains, as far as my theory is concerned. But, if it was first written in Aramaic, then the fact that Matthew did actually compose in that language makes his authorship of the Gospel according to the Hebrews the more probable. And, if the Greek Gospel be not a translation,* may not the Gospel according to the Hebrews

* Papias's statement can hardly be a mere guess. But I put the case thus interrogatively because a third theory is possible—that the Greek Matthew had been translated into Aramaic and that Papias mistook this translation for an original. To render this in the least degree probable one must suppose that no other evangelist had at that time been translated into Aramaic. Now in the Curetonian Syriac, a version in Western Aramaic probably as old as the 2nd cent., 'the Gospel of St. Matthew differs in mode of expression and various other particulars from what we find in the rest'—according to Tregelles (Smith's *Bib. Dic.* iii. 1634). Again, the title of that particular Gospel, and that only, contains a word which Tregelles and others take to mean 'made clear,' and which they suppose to indicate a rendering from a less popular dialect into the vernacular. If, however, it should denote a rendering into Western Aramaic not from Eastern Aramaic but from Greek, then in the use of the word at the heading of this one Gospel, and in the idiosyncrasies of the translation, we may see an evidence that Matthew was translated at a different time from the other evangelists, and since he is the most Hebraistic he would naturally be translated first.

Cureton and Tregelles insist that the Curetonian Syriac is virtually a translation of an original Matthew in Eastern Aramaic. If they are right, my conclusions are not affected one whit. But whether they are right or wrong, the Curetonian Syriac does show several approximations to the text of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and thereby lends it evidence, if not of correctness, at

have been Papias's Aramaic original?—in which case we should have the evidence of a man born in the Apostolic age for the fact, or at least the tradition, of its Matthaean authorship.

We must not forget that the above conclusions have been arrived at solely from internal evidence; we have yet to compare them with the external evidence. That has been summed up already at the end of Part I., but I may with advantage, for our present purpose, abstract it a little further and say that it tends to show

- (i.) that Matthew wrote a Gospel in Aramaic;
- (ii.) that the Greek Matthew is a translation from the Aramaic Matthew;
- (iii.) that Matthew wrote the Gospel according to the Hebrews;
- (iv.) that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was the Aramaic original of the Greek Matthew.

The conclusions I have deduced from internal evidence agree with (i.) and (iii.), they are equally consistent with the correctness or incorrectness of (ii.); they disagree with (iv.) only. But here *res ipsa loquitur*: the Fragments speak for themselves. The Greek Matthew, as it stands, and as it stood in the second century, is not a translation of the Gospel according to the Hebrews as *it* stood either in the days of Epiphanius and Jerome or some two centuries earlier. If the opinion of Epiphanius and Jerome be true, either the Greek or the Aramaic work or both must have undergone any number of additions, omissions, and alterations. To maintain their opinion it was necessary for them to give some evidence as to why, when, or by whom these changes were effected. Their silence shows pretty clearly that they had no such evidence to offer, and I think we may assume without hesitation that, believing in an Aramaic original of the Greek Matthew and finding an Aramaic Gospel (ascribed to him by the tradition of centuries) bearing much substantial and even verbal agreement with the

least of correspondence with an extremely *ancient* form of the canonical Matthew's text.

Greek Gospel, they over hastily jumped to the conclusion that the Aramaic must be *somewhat* the original of the Greek.

And here I might say farewell to my readers, but that I wish to add a few short remarks as to the position of this Gospel in the second century. In reviewing the external evidence, we only traced the use of it as far back as to Hegesippus, writing perhaps about 160 A.D., though we also found that Papias narrated a story which he *might* have borrowed from it. We have since seen that one of the fragments is identical with a quotation in one of the Ignatian epistles, which, taking it for genuine, must be as early as 115 A.D., and if spurious would scarcely be later than the* middle of the same century. It is true that part of the quotation was certainly to be found in †‘the Teaching of Peter,’ and, of course, even otherwise we cannot *prove* that it was made from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Similarly we have found Justin twice out of accord with the established text of the canonical Gospels, but in accord with the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Here, however, Justin is supported by a few early copies of Matthew and Luke, and even if he were not we cannot *prove* that he used the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Still these things, together with the ‡ story told by Papias, are worth mentioning in arrest of judgement, if any one should allege that our Aramaic Gospel was not used by writers of the earlier half of the second century; and they at least afford as early confirmation of its credibility. It is further to be remarked that where the Gospel according to the Hebrews differs from the established text of our Matthew it is often supported to some extent by Codex Bezae, the Old Latin, or the Curetonian Syriac, all of them undoubtedly sprung from second century MSS. Now, if the peculiar readings of these three authorities are right, the text of our Aramaic Gospel gains in credibility; if they are wrong, the question arises

* See Bishop Lightfoot’s article in the *Contemporary Review* for Feb. 1875.

† See pp. 71–3, and also p. 87.

‡ The story of the ‘woman accused of many sins before the Lord.’

whether they may not have been introduced from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and in that case whether the persons who introduced them must not have regarded that Gospel as both authoritative and Matthaean.

The reader who has not studied the history of the Canon will nevertheless assume that far more ancient witness can be brought for the authority and authorship of the canonical Gospels than for the authority and authorship of the Gospel according to the Hebrews. He will make a great mistake. It is true that no writer before Irenaeus (about 180–190 A.D.) speaks of our Aramaic Gospel as the work of Matthew, nor does any writer before his older contemporary Hegesippus, who probably wrote a little earlier, mention its existence. But neither is the authorship or the existence of the Gospels according to John and Luke mentioned by any writer* certainly earlier than these.† The same might be said of the other two canonical Gospels but that Papias (who can hardly have written later than 140 A.D., and may have written a good deal earlier) affirms that Matthew and Mark wrote Gospels, and, as he says that Matthew's Gospel was first written by him in Hebrew, and as we know him to have told a story which was found in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, it becomes a question whether he was not also an authority for our Aramaic Gospel.

But, some one will say, are there not in writers earlier than Irenaeus‡ a large number of seeming, though anonym-

* The other writers in my mind are the author of the Canon Muratorianus and Heracleon. But I regard it as morally certain that Tatian, who was earlier than any of these, compiled his *Diatessaron* from at least three of our Canonical Gospels, with either the Canonical Matthew or the Gospel according to the Hebrews as the fourth.

† There is no proof that the mention of Matthew's Gospel by Apollinaris is earlier. The Canon Muratorianus is defective at the beginning, but, as it speaks of Luke's and John's Gospels as the third and fourth, it is morally certain that the other two which it comprehended were Matthew and Mark.

‡ If any reader should have been misled by the author of *Supernatural Religion* into denying or doubting this, I beg him to read Bishop Lightfoot's articles in the *Contemporary Review*, beginning

mous, quotations from and references to the canonical Gospels? Granting the likelihood (and you barely claim as much) that the Gospel according to the Hebrews is quoted or referred to by Papias, Justin, and the author of a probably genuine Ignatian epistle, you need far more to convince us that your Aramaic Gospel can have been generally looked upon as an Apostolic or even an authoritative writing.

To this I might reply by admitting that there are no more quotations from or references to it, but pointing out

in Dec. 1874, and Dr. Sanday's *Gospels in the Second Century*. Those on the other hand who have not read the book may like to know what is the author's way of dealing with such early quotations. First of all he brands the works containing them as spurious, whenever he can find a good or a bad pretext for so doing: but in any case he assigns to them the latest conceivable date. With these reservations he proceeds to discuss the supposed quotations. If they are at all free, he carefully abstains from enquiring whether the works containing them show the same looseness in quoting from the Old Testament; he equally neglects the analogies presented by Old Testament quotations in the New, and by acknowledged loose quotations from the Gospels in later writers; and dismissing as absurd the idea of 'quotation from memory' he pronounces them to have been taken from some lost Gospel. If on the other hand the quotations are exact or very close, he will try to prove either that they are interpolations or that the corresponding texts in our Gospels have been interpolated. Or he will say that as the text occurs in more than one of our Gospels it was evidently part of the common stock of Gospel-writers, and may just as well have been in lost Gospels also. Or he will urge that some apocryphal book quoted elsewhere by the writer who is under consideration may have furnished it. Having got rid of all quotations before Irenaeus (180–190 A.D.) by one or more of these methods, and having pronounced that the Gospels quoted by earlier writers and read (as we know from Justin) in the weekly assemblies of Christians were uncanonical, he does not explain when, why, or how these old and *then* canonical Scriptures were degraded and the present Gospels (before unknown) substituted—so suddenly and with such general agreement that from Irenaeus onward we find them (except among heretical sects) in almost absolute possession of the field, and no other Gospel named in any subsequent list of canonical books. But the writer does not perceive that he has achieved nothing beyond a *reductio ad absurdum* of his own argument.

that it was written in Aramaic, that there is not the least proof that it had been translated, that most of the writers alluded to did not know Aramaic, and that in any case they would probably avoid quoting a Gospel which those whom they were addressing had not read and were not able to read.

But there is another answer. Had any one of the canonical Gospels been lost, or preserved only to the extent of a few fragments, we should have been unable to detect all these early references to it. In some cases we should have treated what we now recognise to be a distinct reference to that particular Gospel as a loose reference from memory to a parallel passage in one of the three Gospels which alone would have been preserved to us; and where no such parallel existed we should have found ourselves at the end of our tether. Now what might have happened to any one of the canonical Gospels is precisely what has happened to the Gospel according to the Hebrews. There are many yet untraced quotations and traditions, all of which *may*, and some of which probably do belong to it. Of course, every one of these *may* be taken from some other of the many lost Gospels: still, not one of those Gospels held in the estimation of the Fathers a place approaching that of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, nor are the known quotations from any one of them to be compared in number with the known quotations from our Aramaic Gospel. Again, many of the apparent references to our Gospels are decidedly loose. This looseness is exactly paralleled by the looseness with which the Old Testament is often quoted by the same writers (and in the New Testament), and with which the New Testament itself is often quoted by later writers.* Still, in some at least of these cases the reference really *may* be to

* It must be clearly understood that wherever the parallels of thought and language are fairly near I admit probability to be on the side of the Canonical Gospels against *all* lost Gospels, but if the quotations in question be not from the Canonical Gospels, probability is, I think, in each case in favour of the Gospel according to the Hebrews against *all other* lost Gospels. I should not have ventured the above suggestion at all if we did not know that the Aramaic Gospel had strong canonical affinities.

the Gospel according to the Hebrews, especially where the connexion seems to be with Matthew.

And now at last, having examined every aspect of my subject which has suggested itself to me, I may close an investigation which will not have been undertaken in vain if this Gospel should really be a work coeval with the canonical records of the life of Jesus. If on the other hand my deductions have been wrong and my conjectures groundless, I shall, at least, have the satisfaction of furnishing to some more sagacious critic that armoury of facts wherewith saving Truth alive he is welcome to kill my theories.

ADDENDA.

P. 5. The following are the passages of Irenaeus and Eusebius to be compared :—

IRENAEUS, *Adv. Haer.* i. 26 § 2 (extant in the old Latin translation only), Solo autem eo quod est secundum Matthaeum Evangelio utuntur, et Apostolum Paulum recusant, apostatam eum Legis dicentes—‘ They use that Gospel only which is according to Matthew, and refuse the Apostle Paul, calling him an apostate from the Law.’

EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 27, Τοῦ μὲν Ἀποστόλου πάσας τὰς ἐπιστολὰς ἀρνητέας ἥγοῦντο εἶναι δεῖν, ἀποστάτην ἀποκαλοῦντες τοῦ Νόμου. Εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ μόνῳ τῷ καθ’ Ἐβραίους λεγομένῳ χρώμενοι τῶν λοιπῶν σμικρὸν ἐποιοῦντο λόγον—‘ They held that all the epistles of the Apostle ought to be refused, calling him an apostate from the Law: and, using that Gospel alone which is called *according to the Hebrews*, they took small account of the rest.’

P. 26. From p. 243 of Volkmar’s edition (1860) of Credner’s *Kanon*, I find that a later Nikephorus, Nikephorus Callistus, a Byzantine monk who wrote about 1330 A.D., puts the Gospel according to the Hebrews among spurious books. His list is, however, a mere paraphrase, with slight variations, of the list of Eusebius.

§ Their weight has since been neutralized by my finding from pp. 52 seqq. of Burgon's Last 12 verses of St. Mark² that Jerome to Hedybia is a mere re-edition of Eusebius to Marinus, and that Mihique — vespae is a mere paraphrase of Eusebius, for the original of which see Migne's Eusebius vi. 91.

The passage referring to the Gospel according to the Hebrews runs thus: 'And nowadays let the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* also be numbered among these [spurious books], which they out of the Hebrews who came to Christ loved with joyfulness beyond any other' (*Ἡδη δὲ ἐν τούτοις καὶ τὸ καθ' Ἐβραίους Εὐαγγέλιον ἀριθμεῖσθω, φῶ μάλιστα οἱ ἐξ Ἐβραίων Χριστῷ προσιόντες ἔχαιρον ἀσμενίζοντες*.—*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 46).

The reader who compares this with my first quotation from Eusebius on p. 5 will be amused, and will agree that the opinion of Nikephorus Callistus (who lived about 900 years after Theodoret, the last independent writer who mentions this Gospel, and about 500 years after the copyist of Codex Tischendorfianus III., in which is found the last trace of its existence) has not even a feather's weight in the balance of evidence.

P. 51, note on Fr. 21. The following considerations make me more doubtful.³ In the letter to Hedybia, § 4, Jerome writes: 'And the Evangelist Matthew, who composed the Gospel in the Hebrew speech, seems to me to have said [in xxvii. 1] not so much *in the evening* as *late*, and he who translated—deceived by the ambiguity of the word—to have translated not *late* but *in the evening*. Although the custom of men's speech holds, that *late* signifies not evening but *after delay*' (*Mihique videtur Evangelistam Matthaeum, qui Evangelium Hebraico sermone conscripsit, non tam vespere dixisse quam sero, et eum qui interpretatus est, verbi ambiguitate deceptum, non sero interpretatum esse, sed vespere. Quamquam consuetudo humani sermonis teneat, sero non vesperum significare sed tarde*). Now, if the Gospel according to the Hebrews had *late* why did not Jerome quote it? It seems to me, therefor, that as regards Matt. xxvii. 1 he conjectures that Matthew wrote in Aramaic something which was not in the Nazarene Gospel—perhaps assuming a double Aramaic edition. He may have done so equally as regards Matt. xxi. 9, and *barrama* may be merely what he thought a safe guess at the original—introduced to show off his learning to his patron the Pope.

P. 60, 4th note. I have forgotten to fulfil the promise

given on p. 14 to quote the words in which Epiphanius ‘accuses the Ebionites of having interpolated in a certain verse not only the word $\mu\eta$, but the two letters μ and η .’

After the first passage quoted from him on p. 60 he goes on thus: Πόθεν δὲ οὐ φωραθήσεται ἡ αὐτῶν ράδιονρύτα, τῆς ἀκολονθίας κραζούσης ὅτι τὸ μῦ καὶ τὸ ἡτά ἔστι προσθετά;—‘But how shall their fraudulence escape detection, when the context cries out that the μ and the η are tacked on?’

Pp. 88-9. I should like for *Μαρκιανός*, *καὶ* to read *Μαρκίων*, *ώς καὶ*. The difference in sound, setting aside accent, would be expressed by *Markiahnoss* and *Markiawn(h)awss*, which a tired copyist from dictation might easily confound.

Marcion was a Doketist; his orthodox opponents insisted that his opinions were contradicted by his own Gospel; and he was accused of interpolating Luke as well as mutilating him. The charge of mutilation was, indeed, the chief indictment; yet so long as Serapion’s flock read the original Luke as well as Marcion’s Luke that bishop might think the interpolations alone dangerous.

But Marcion’s Gospel, which he called only ‘the Gospel,’ was thoroughly anti-Judaistic, and he almost seems to have repudiated all Apostles but Paul. And, though Eastern Marcionites of a later date might just conceivably supply the unhappy want of an author’s name to this Gospel by giving it the name of Peter (although we should have expected that of Paul, whom Marcion declared to have used it), yet a Gospel which, so far as we know, was only a mutilated Luke can hardly have included the statement which Origen seems to attribute to the Gospel according to Peter.

Still it is possible that the Gospel according to Peter was in use among Syriac Marcionites (of whom we hear as late as Theodoret) and that it bore some ascription which connected it or its transcriber with Marcion.

Lardner (*History of Heretics*, bk. ii. 11, § 6) supposes Lucanus, Lucianus, or Leucius—the asserted forger of Apocrypha—to have written the Gospel according to Peter, he being a Marcionite, and Lardner taking *Μαρκιανός* to mean Marcion. And after $\tauῶν$ διαδόχων $\tauῶν$ καταρξαμένων $αὐτοῦ$ Lardner writes *Μαρκιανοῦ* in brackets, construing, I

suppose, ‘the succession of teachers who began with him.’ But *κατάρχεσθαι τίνος* seems to mean only ‘to begin,’ not ‘to begin with,’ and, though I do not like my own rendering of the passage, Liddell and Scott and Sophocles offer me no alternative.

I may add that, if the Gospel according to Peter did contain the statement spoken of by Origen, that statement seems intended to support the theory of Mary’s perpetual virginity—a very odd intention in a Doketist book, though we do hear from Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* i. 30, § 12) that Doketist Ophites held Jesus to have been born of a virgin.

P. 102. According to Credner (*Kanon*, 120) Nikephorus (the earlier) states that the Gospel according to the Hebrews contained $\beta\varsigma'$, i.e. 2,006 $\sigmaτίχοι$. And Volkmar (*Kanon*, 243) says that so Credner has written in the MS. of his work. But all the MSS. of the Latin translation of the ninth century agree in reading 2,200, and so Volkmar is almost certainly right in saying that we ought to read $\beta\varsigma'$, i.e. 2,200.

In either case the Gospel according to the Hebrews would be shorter than those according to Matthew and Luke, to the former of which Nikephorus gives 2,500, and to the latter 2,600 $\sigmaτίχοι$.

APPENDICES.

A. PROF. WESTCOTT'S STATEMENT OF THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

I SHALL first copy Prof. Westcott's statement (*Canon of the New Testament*, ed. 1875, p. 510) and make my remarks on it as I go.

'One passage which occurred in the Gospel according to the Hebrews is found in a letter of Ignatius, who does not however quote the words as written, but only on traditional authority.'

Any reader might think that Ignatius gave tradition as his authority; it is, however, only Prof. Westcott's inference that he *must* have quoted from tradition. I will add that it is a very bad inference, for the form of Ignatius's words (see my first note to Fr. 30) makes it all but certain that he was quoting a written document—a conclusion strengthened by the fact that he goes on to speak upon the same subject in words plainly adapted from Acts.

'Papias again related a story "of a woman accused of many crimes before our Lord, which was contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews," but the words of Eusebius seem to imply that he did not refer to that book as the source of the narrative.'

Quite fairly stated.

'The evangelic quotations of Justin Martyr offer no support to the notion that he used it as a coordinate authority with the Canonical Gospels, but on the contrary distinguish a detail which it contained from that which was written in the Apostolic memoirs.'

I cannot dispute Prof. Westcott's right to put the case thus—though see my note on Fr. 7—and it is just to add that he gives a foot-reference to a passage where he deals with the point more fully.

'Hegesippus is the first author who was certainly acquainted

with it; but there is nothing to show that he attributed to it any peculiar authority.'

Quite fairly stated.

'Clement of Alexandria and Origen both quote the book, but both distinctly affirm that the four Canonical Gospels stood alone as acknowledged records of the Lord's life.'

No notice is taken of Irenaeus.

We are not told that Clement quotes it with the words 'it is written.'

Prof. Westcott leaves out of sight the fact that it was held by Irenaeus (seemingly), Epiphanius, Jerome, and Theodoret (seemingly), as well as by popular opinion among those who used it, to be a mere Aramaic edition of a Canonical Gospel. If Clement and Origen thought the same, they of course included it when they spoke of the four Canonical Gospels.

'Epiphanius regarded the "Hebrew Gospel" as a heretical work based on St. Matthew.'

No notice is taken of Eusebius, who twice quotes the Gospel according to the Hebrews—once directly attributing the quoted words to Jesus himself—and who implies that it was anciently held canonical and that its canonicity was only beginning to be denied.

Speaking of the *Ebionite* 'Hebrew Gospel,' Epiphanius once calls it the Gospel according to Matthew, and once says that it was 'named according to Matthew' and that they did not use it 'in complete entirety, but corrupted and mutilated.' Now, is the meaning of Epiphanius fairly given in the words 'based on St. Matthew'?

Before speaking of the Ebionite Gospel Epiphanius says of the *Nazarenes* that 'they have the Gospel according to Matthew most complete in Hebrew. For assuredly this is still kept among them, according as it was at outset written, in Hebrew letters.'

'Jerome has referred to it several times, and he translated it into Latin, but he nowhere attributes to it any peculiar authority, and calls St. John expressly the fourth and last Evangelist.'

In a foot-note Prof. Westcott gives references to nine, and speaks of 'the remaining passages.' Still I think for 'several' he might have written 'thirteen.'

Jerome also translated it into Greek.

Jerome not only records twice over, without demur, the common belief in its Matthaeaean authorship, but once distinctly states that it was the original of the Greek Matthew.

This being so, it cannot be of the slightest significance that he ‘calls St. John expressly the fourth and last Evangelist.’

‘ Yet the fact that he appealed to that book as giving the testimony of antiquity furnished occasion for an adversary to charge him with making “ a fifth Gospel ; ” and at a later time, in deference to Jerome’s judgment, Bede reckoned it among the “ ecclesiastical ” rather than the “ Apocryphal writings.” ’

No notice is taken of Theodoret.

Bede, after speaking of Apocryphal Gospels, says ‘ Here it is to be noted that the Gospel according to the Hebrews, as it is called, is not to be counted among apocryphal but among ecclesiastical histories : for it seemed good even to the very translator of Holy Scripture, Jerome, to use many evidences from it, and to translate it into the Latin and Greek language.’ I think Prof. Westcott makes Bede seem more doubtful than do Bede’s own words, but I do not press this.

No notice is taken of Nikephorus.

If I were now to ask Prof. Westcott’s most partial friend ‘ Is not this statement of the external evidence hopelessly unfair ? ’ I should expect him to answer ‘ Well, if he did not know of more evidence for it, how was he to give more evidence ? Remember that while you have professedly made a special study of this Gospel, he has not.’ I might simply reply that, if Prof. Westcott had only looked out his own foot-references to Ignatius and Jerome it was impossible for him, judging and writing fairly, to represent their evidence as he has done. But I find that the edition of Prof. Westcott’s book which I have quoted is not only ‘ revised,’ and might therefore have been expected to derive some benefit from Hilgenfeld’s edition of the Gospel according to the Hebrews published no fewer than eight years before, but it is revised, as the author says, partly by the help of the adverse criticism of *Supernatural Religion*. Prof. Westcott expresses himself much indebted to this criticism : he seems to have read the book through : he gives nearly 40 pp. of Preface to it : and of this number he gives nearly two pages to criticizing some statements respecting the Gospel according to the Hebrews many of which were indeed quite unfounded. Now, the writer of *Supernatural Religion* puts forward the claims of, and his own undue pretensions for, the Gospel according to the Hebrews more fully in vol. i. pp. 420-6 than elsewhere, and a statement about it on one of those pages Prof. Westcott quotes at length. If Prof. Westcott read those pages and either took on trust (which he would hardly do) the statements there made as to the evidence of

Irenaeus, Clement, Jerome, Theodoret, and Nikephorus, or looked at the passages referred to in the foot-notes in support of those statements, it was impossible for him, judging and writing fairly, to misrepresent some of that evidence and leave out the rest.

As regards Nikephorus I may add that Prof. Westcott in his own book prints Nikephorus's canon and stichometry in full.

Not even yet, however, are we in a position to pronounce on Prof. Westcott's statement the opinion that ought to be pronounced. I invite the reader's careful attention to the following amazing facts:—

The editions of Prof. Westcott's work on the Canon bear date 1855, 1866 ('the whole essay has been carefully revised'), 1870 ('carefully revised throughout'), 1875 ('revised').

The editions of Prof. Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* bear date 1860, 1867, 1872, 1875.

The latter work contains an Appendix—Appendix D—'On some of the Apocryphal Gospels.' The first two sections are given to 'The Gospel according to the Hebrews' and 'The Gospel of the Ebionites.' These sections fill rather more than five pages, pp. 462–7 of the 1875 edition, and consist chiefly of a translation of Fragments, with notes: in the notes the originals are given. Beyond a few words stating that Papias needs not have used the Gospel according to the Hebrews and that a certain quotation from Hegesippus and certain words of Jerome are not to be referred to it (in all of which views he is quite right), with 6½ lines relating to the witness of Epiphanius, Prof. Westcott says nothing about the external evidence.

I have not compared all this word by word with the edition of 1860, and so, though I at a general glance see no change, there may be some. I pledge myself, however, that all the statements which I am now going to extract from the 1875 edition are word for word in the edition of 1860. The small capitals are mine.

(1) On p. 462 we are referred to p. 457 for a Fragment. It is the fragment from the *Theophania* of Eusebius, and the important parts are thus rendered by Prof. Westcott: '[CHRIST] HIMSELF taught, as we have found in a place in the Gospel existing among the Jews in the Hebrew language, in which it is said.' In a note the reference to Eusebius is given, and Prof. Westcott, by saying 'this quotation seems to have been unnoticed,' must himself have been the discoverer of it.

(2) On p. 463 Prof. Westcott translates thus from Jerome: 'The Gospel entitled *according to the Hebrews*, WHICH I LATELY TRANSLATED INTO GREEK and Latin.' He gives in a note the reference and the original.

(3) On p. 464 he translates thus from Jerome: 'In the Gospel which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use, WHICH I LATELY TRANSLATED FROM THE HEBREW INTO GREEK.' In a note he gives the reference and original.

(4) On p. 465, in the second section, headed 'The Gospel of the Ebionites,' he says 'Epiphanius speaks of the Nazarenes as "HAVING THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW IN A MOST COMPLETE FORM* IN HEBREW," though he immediately adds that he does not know whether† "they removed the genealogies from Abraham to Christ." In a note he gives the reference and original, *including the original of the following sentence, which he does not allude to in his text*, 'For assuredly this is still kept among them, according as it was at outset written, in Hebrew letters.'

(5) He then adds in his text 'IN CONTRAST WITH THIS STATEMENT he says that the Ebionites had a Gospel called the Gospel according to Matthew, not entire and perfectly complete, but falsified and mutilated, which they call the Hebrew Gospel.'

We see from (1) that in 1860 he knew that Eusebius had quoted words from the Gospel according to the Hebrews as the words of '[Christ] Himself.'

We see from (2) and (3) that in 1860 he knew that Jerome had translated that Gospel into Greek as well as Latin.

We see from (4) that in 1860 ‡ he knew the passage in which Epiphanius practically says that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was the original of the Greek Matthew.

Yet, although these are points of moment—the first and last of the highest moment—in favour of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, he made no mention of one of them in the connected statement of the external evidence which he published in his other book in 1866, 1870, and 1875. The entire § text of that statement remains exactly as it was printed in 1855.

* The 1860 ed. has a comma after 'form.'

† The 1860 ed. has the mark of quotation before 'removed.'

‡ Nay, in 1851. For on p. 240 of his *Elements of the Gospel Harmony* published in that year he says 'Jerome, who translated into Greek and Latin a copy of this Gospel.'

§ There is one addition in a foot-note. The statement about Bede has, and had in the first edition, this note:—

'Bede, *Comm. in Luc. init.* quoted on Hieron. *adv. Pelag.* iii. 2.'

Prof. Westcott has himself in a former note quoted 'Hieron. *adv. Pelag.* iii. 2,' but has not quoted Bede. As the note first stood one would therefor suppose that he was referring to Credner, from whom he confessedly took his references to Jerome.

To this note are now added the words 'See *Introduction to the Study of the*

On the other hand we see from (5) that Prof. Westcott had between 1855 and 1860 come to look on the Ebionite Gospel of Epiphanius as distinct from the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

Yet in the editions of his other book published in 1866, 1870, and 1875 he still (as in 1855) applies to the latter Gospel the damaging statement made by Epiphanius with reference to the former only.

And now what does Prof. Westcott's most partial friend say ?

B. PAPIAS AND MATTHEW.

I have not discussed whether the Papiasts are right in affirming or the Erasmians in denying an Aramaic original of the Canonical Gospel according to Matthew, and I have admitted that the Aramaic Gospel spoken of by Papias *may* have been the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

But I do not see how we can refuse to believe that Matthew wrote *some* Aramaic Gospel. Independently of the mere antiquity of Papias, Eusebius has preserved another passage from his work which makes it very difficult to suppose that he was mistaken altogether on this point.

In the prospectus of this work which I sent out I stated that I had 'amended the translation of an important fragment of Papias bearing on this question,' meaning the passage which I am now going to translate. I have since convinced myself that my correction of the printed text was needless; but—as at the place in point Prof. Westcott has not translated rightly; and as he, the writer of *Supernatural Religion*, and, to my surprise, Bishop Lightfoot, have all missed the meaning of one interesting expression—I shall still translate the passage and say what I have to say on it:—

* 'And I shall not hesitate to range for thee by the side of my

Gospels, App. D.' On looking there we find 'Hieron. *adv. Pelag.* iii. 2' again quoted, but no Bede. I presume, therefor, that this addition is a curiously disguised direction to the reader to see the Appendix in question on the Gospel according to the Hebrews generally—a very perfect instance of literary suicide.

Prof. Westcott in the Appendix in question not only separates the Nazarene and the Ebionite Gospels, but says of 'several passages professedly taken from' the latter by Epiphanius that 'they present so many inconsistencies that they cannot have belonged originally to the same book.' Let me deal with Prof. Westcott's writings as Epiphanius and time have dealt with the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and the few fragments that I will leave shall carry overwhelming conviction to Macaulay's New Zealander that the *History of the Canon of the New Testament* and the *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* cannot have belonged to the same writer.

* Οὐκ ὀκνήσω δέ σοι καὶ θσα ποτὲ παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καλῶς ζημαθον καὶ καλῶς

interpretations all moreover that from time to time I carefully learnt from the elders and carefully committed to memory, and to confirm truth † as their proxy. For I did not take pleasure, as the vulgar do, in those who were full of talk, but in those who taught the truth; nor in those who repeated the commandments of others, but in those who repeated the commandments which the Lord delivered to faith, and of which the source was truth itself. And if perchance there came any one who had been in the following of the elders, I enquired the elders' words—what Andrew, or what Peter had said; or what Philip, or what Thomas, or James; or what John or MATTHEW or any other one of the Lord's disciples; ‡ and

ἐμνημόνευσα συγκαταράξαι ταῖς ἔρμηνεσι, διαβεβαιούμενος ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀλήθειαν. Οὐ γὰρ τοῖς τὰ πολλὰ λέγουσιν ἔχαιρον, δισκερ οἱ πολλοὶ, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τὰληθῆ διδάσκουσιν· οὐδὲ τοῖς τὰς ἀλλοτρίας ἐντολὰς μημονεύουσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τὰς παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου τῷ πιστεῖ δεδομένας, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῆς παραγινομένας τῆς ἀληθείας. Εἰ δέ που καὶ παρηκολουθηκάς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον ἀλόγους· τί 'Ανδρέας, ἢ τί Πέτρος εἴπεν· ἢ τί Φίλιππος· ἢ τί Θωμᾶς ἢ 'Ιάκωβος· ἢ τί 'Ιωάννης ἢ Ματθαῖος ἢ τις ἔτερος τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῶν· ἢ τε' Αριστίων καὶ δ πρεσβύτερος 'Ιωάννης, οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί, λέγουσιν. Οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τοσοῦτάν με ἀφελεῖν ὑπελάμβανον δούν τὰ παρὰ ζώσις φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39).

† ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. Not 'that it is true,' as Prof. Westcott (*Canon*, 70), or 'its truth,' as the author of *Supernatural Religion* (i. 445), or 'their truth,' as Bishop Lightfoot (*Contemp. Rev.*, Aug. 1875).

‡ Prof. Westcott here renders 'as what' (*Canon*, 69). He clearly had before him an edition of Eusebius in which, as in that before me now, & τε is run into &τε; and not being able to make anything of this he conjectured that a following τι was lost or was at least to be understood.

The writer of *Supernatural Religion* and Bishop Lightfoot, whichever reading they had, construe rightly from & τε, and this is Harnack's reading in the edition (1878) of the Fragments of Papias before me; it was also the reading of Rufinus (for he renders *quaeve*), who translated Eusebius only about eighty years after Eusebius wrote.

My difficulty with the text was that I did not believe in & being used where one would look for τίνα. Harnack refers to 2 Clem. i. 2, where we have οὐκ εἰδότες πόθεν ἐκλήθημεν καὶ ὑπὸ τίνος καὶ εἰς δν τόπον, καὶ δος ὑπέμεινεν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς παθεῖν ἔνεκεν ἡμῶν. Here one might conjecture οἷον or explain εἰς δν τόπον as = τὸν τόπον εἰς δν. Madvig (*Gk. Syntax*, Browne and Arnold's translation, 1873, p. 187) gives Θεμιστοκλῆς φράζει τῷ ναυκλήρῳ δοτις ἐστὶ καὶ δι' & φεύγει (Thuc. i. 137), but there one might render 'and the reasons for which': he also gives Δι' & αἵτις τὰ περὶ τὴν ἀκοὴν ἐμμεθαίνει παθήματα, λεκτέον (Pl., *Tim.* 67), but there one might explain δι' & αἵτις as = τὰς αἵτις δι' &. But in Soph. *Aj.* 1259 (*μαθὼν δι' εἰ φύσιν*) δις = οἷος, and the case before us seems essentially parallel—besides which we may render, not 'and what,' but 'and the things which,' as I have preferred to do. At the same time I think no one will deny that, if the meaning of Papias be what it has hitherto been taken to be, καὶ τι or τι δὲ or ἢ τι would have been more natural.

My correction was, reading &τε, to put from that to *Κυρίον* in brackets—rendering 'or what John or Matthew or any other one of the Lord's disciples (as Aristion

the things that Aristion and the Elder John, the disciples of the Lord, say. For I did not suppose that what was out of the books was of so much benefit to me as what came from a living and abiding voice.'

May not the 'books' be Gospels by anonymous authors or authors who were not Apostles or companions of Jesus?

'Each interpreted them as he was able' seems to imply that when Papias wrote there was a single accepted version.

Yet Papias may never have seen the Aramaic Gospel (? the Gospel according to the Hebrews) and Matthew may have written another in Greek, which Papias mistook for a translation of the former.

C. THE GOSPEL OF CARPOCRATES AND KERINTHUS.

Hilgenfeld and the author of *Supernational Religion* (i. 421) say that the heretics Carpocrates and Kerinthus used the Ebionite Gospel, on the faith of the following passage of Epiphanius:—

'But see how their [the Ebionites'] doctrine has been corrupted at every point, how everything is halting and crooked and has no rightness. For Kerinthus and Carpocras, using forsooth the same Gospel that they have, wish to show from the beginning of the Gospel according to Matthew that the Christ is of the seed of Joseph and Mary. But these are of another sort of mind. For having cut away the genealogies in Matthew they begin by way of commencement, as I have previously said, with the statement that "It came to pass" etc.*'

If this passage proved that Carpocrates and Kerinthus used the Ebionite Gospel it would be a most important witness for the

and the Elder John, the disciple of the Lord) say.' The objection to this is not so much that λέγοντις, 'say,' ought to be λέγει, 'says'—for it might be influenced by the plural 'disciples,' an inadvertence of which Shakspere and our everyday talk yield many instances—but that 'the disciples of the Lord' would be an altogether useless repetition.

The correction, had it been sound, would have been most important, because it would then have been implied (by the use of the present tense) that not only Aristion and the Elder John but John the Apostle and Matthew were still alive when Papias was making his enquiries.

* *Haer. xxx. 14.* Ὁρὰ δὲ τὴν παρ' αὐτοῖς παραπεπομένην πανταχθεὶν διδασκαλίαν, πῶς πάντα χωλά, λοξά, καὶ οὐδεμιαν ὀρθότητα ἔχοντα. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ Κήρυνθος καὶ Καρποκρᾶς, τῷ αὐτῷ χρόμενοι παρ' αὐτοῖς Εὐαγγελίῳ, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγελίου βούλονται παριστᾶν ἐπιέρματος Ἰωσήφ καὶ Μαρίας ἔναι τὸν Χριστόν. Οὗνοι δὲ ἄλλα τινὰ διαγούνται. Παρακύψαντες γὰρ τὰς παρὰ τῷ Ματθαῖῳ γενεαλογίας ἀρχονται τὴν ἀρχὴν ποιεῖσθαι, ὡς προεῖπον, λέγοντες δὲ Ἐγένετο—the quotation is given above, p. 15.

antiquity of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, since Kerinthus is reported to have been a contemporary of the Apostle John, while † ‘the Fathers in general place Carpocrates before Cerinthus,’ ‘Irenaeus seems to speak of his followers as the first who assumed the name of *Gnostics*,’ and ‘he is said, in conjunction with his son Epiphanes, to have carried his heresy to its height in the reign of Hadrian,’ ‡ i.e. between 117 and 138 A.D.

But the words of Epiphanius do not seem to me to justify the conclusion that these two early heretics used the Gospel according to the Hebrews. In a former part of his work (*Haer. xxviii. 5*) he has said that the school of Kerinthus ‘use the Gospel according to Matthew, in part and not entire, but for the sake of the genealogy in the flesh.’§ He calls it simply the Gospel according to Matthew, without saying that it was called, or was, the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or that it was written in Hebrew characters. Again, he has before told us that the Ebionites too ‘receive the Gospel according to Matthew; for this they too, as also the Kerinthians and Merinthians, use to the exclusion of the rest. And they call it “according to the Hebrews.”’|| From this we learn nothing more than that the Kerinthians used the Gospel according to Matthew. And in the passage before us the argument of Epiphanius may be paraphrased as follows:—‘See how perversely the Ebionites have dealt with the text of Matthew. For such heretics as the Kerinthians who use the same Gospel of Matthew have still left the genealogies, which they submit as evidence of the human birth of Christ. The Ebionites might have done the same had they chosen, but such half measures are not to their taste—they have cut away the genealogies altogether.’ He has already told us that the Kerinthians use only Matthew, and that the Ebionites use only Matthew; now that for the purpose of strengthening his strictures against the latter for their corruption of Matthew’s text he holds up to them the contrary example (in this particular case) of the

† These quotations are from Mansel’s *Gnostic Heresies*, 117, 118.

‡ Taking 127 A.D. as the mean, and concluding that Epiphanes, who died at the age of 17, must have been at least 15 before he became a sectarian leader, we get 112 A.D. as the approximate date of the birth of Epiphanes. At that time Carpocrates may have been 20 or he may have been 60; taking 30 as a reasonable age, we should carry back his birth to 82 A.D. But all that we can say is that Carpocrates was almost certainly born not later than 100 A.D., and may have been born as early as 50 A.D.

§ Χρῶνται γὰρ τῷ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγελίῳ, ἀπὸ μέρους καὶ οὐχὶ δλφ, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν γενεαλογίαν τὴν ἔνσαρκον (*Haer. xxviii. 5*).

|| Καὶ δέχονται μὲν καὶ αὐτὸν τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγέλιον· τούτῳ γὰρ καὶ αὐτοὶ, ὡς καὶ οἱ κατὰ Κήρυκον καὶ Μήρινθον, χρῶνται μόνφ. Καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὸν ‘κατὰ Ἐβραιοὺς’ (*Haer. xxx. 3*).

Kerinthians, who use ‘the same Gospel,’ is it not straining the meaning of words to infer that the Kerinthisian Matthew followed in all other respects the peculiarities of the Ebionite text?

D. TATIAN'S DIATESSARON.

We have seen that the Gospel according to the Hebrews cannot have been composed by Tatian. But the writer of *Supernatural Religion* maintains that Tatian ‘did not actually compose any Harmony at all, but simply made use of the same Gospel as his master Justin, namely the Gospel according to the Hebrews’ (ii. 159). Let us examine the statements of other early writers besides Epiphanius, and with them the theory built on them in *Supernatural Religion*.

Eusebius, then, tells us that ‘Tatian having put together a certain [or, a sort of] connexion and combination [or, condensation], I know not how, of the Gospels, named this the “Dia tessaron” : and it is current among some up to the present day.’* The writer of *Supernatural Religion* says ‘It is clear that this information is not to be relied on, for not only is it based upon mere hearsay, but it is altogether indefinite as to the character of the contents, and the writer admits his own ignorance (*οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως*) regarding them’ (ii. 154).

Now, (i.) there is not a particle of evidence that Eusebius’s statement is based upon mere hearsay, and that he had never seen the Diatessaron. Indeed, probability runs very strongly in the other direction. Eusebius was bishop of Caesarea, and, even if the library of Pamphilus at that place contained no copy of the Diatessaron †, he can hardly have failed to see elsewhere a book so popular in parts at least of Syria that (as we shall presently learn) more than a hundred years later Theodoret found upwards of 200 copies current among the churches of his own diocese. (ii.) Eusebius tells us quite clearly that Tatian dovetailed the narratives of the Gospels into each other, forming out of them one combined history; and not even the author of *Supernatural Religion* will deny that by ‘the Gospels’ Eusebius means Matthew (possibly including the Gospel according to the Hebrews), Mark, Luke, and John. His information is therefor anything but ‘altogether indefinite as to the character of its contents.’ (iii.) As to the assertion that Eusebius admits his ‘own ignorance (*οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως*) regarding them,’ it should be observed that he does not say ‘I do not know of what kind’—

* ‘Ο Τατλανός συνδέειν τινά καὶ συναγωγήν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως τῶν Εὐαγγελίων συνθεῖς τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων τοῦτο προσωνύμιασσεν· δὲ καὶ παρὰ τισιν εἰσέτι νῦν φέρεται (*Hist. Eccl.* iv. 29).

† Which from the fact mentioned by Theodoret seems very unlikely.

referring to the character of the contents—but ‘I do not know how,’ referring to the way in which Tatian ‘put together’ his materials. We do not know how perplexing Tatian’s method of compilation may have been. He may have adopted as the base of his narrative sometimes the account of one evangelist, sometimes that of another, where the character of the accounts afforded no explanation of such varying preference: his work may have been deficient in chronological system: and finally he may have omitted salient portions of the Gospels which he professed to combine—a charge which, with whatever justice, was (as we shall presently see) actually brought against him.

Theodore † is, after Epiphanius, the next writer who mentions the Diatessaron. ‘He also,’ says Theodore, ‘put together the so-called “Gospel through Four,” after having cut away the genealogies and everything else that shows the Lord to have been born of the seed of David according to the flesh. And this was used, not only by those of his company, but also by those who followed the doctrines of the Apostles, not perceiving the knavery of the compilation, but in their simplicity having taken the book into use because it was concise. And I myself also found more than 200 such books held in honour in the churches among us, and having gathered them all together I put them away and introduced in their stead the Gospels of the four Evangelists.’ §

Upon this the writer of *Supernatural Religion* remarks ‘Theodore . . . not only does not say that it is based upon our four Gospels, but, on the contrary, points out that Tatian’s Gospel did not contain the genealogies and passages tracing the descent of Jesus through the race of David, which our Synoptics possess, and he so much condemned the mischievous design of the work that he confiscated the copies in circulation in his diocese as heretical. Canon Westcott’s assertion that Theodore regarded it as a compilation of our four Gospels is most unfounded and arbitrary. Omissions, as he himself points out, are natural to a Harmony, and conciseness certainly would be the last quality for which it could

† Bishop of Cyrus or Kyrrhus, in Syria. The passage quoted was written between 451 and 458 A.D.

‡ Οὗτος καὶ τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων καλούμενον συντέθεικεν Εὐαγγέλιον, τὰς γενεαλογίας περικόψας καὶ τὰ ἄλλα δοτὰ ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα γεγενημένον τὸν Κύριον δείκνυσιν. Ἐχρήσαντο δὲ τούτῳ οἱ μόνον οἱ τῆς ἑκείνου συμμορίας ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ τοῦς Ἀποστολικοῖς ἐπόμενοι δόγμασι, τὴν τῆς συνθήκης κακουργίαν οὐκ ἐγνωκότες, ἀλλ’ ἀπλούστερον ὡς συντόμῳ τῷ βιβλίῳ χρησάμενοι. Εἴδορον δὲ κάγω πλείους ἡ διακοσίας βιβλίους τοιαύτας ἐν ταῖς παρ’ ἡμῖν ἔκελησταις τετιμημένας· καὶ πάσας συναγαγόν ἀπεθέμην καὶ τὰ τῶν τεττάρων Εὐαγγελιστῶν ἀντεισήγαγον Εὐαγγέλια (*Haer. Fab.* i. 20).

have been so highly prized, if every part of the four Gospels had been retained. The omission of the parts referred to, which are equally omitted from the canonical fourth Gospel, could not have been sufficient to merit the condemnation of the work as heretical, and had Tatian's Gospel not been different in various respects from our four Gospels, such treatment would have been totally unwarrantable. The statement, moreover, that in place of Tatian's Gospel Theodoret "introduced the Gospels of the four Evangelists," seems to indicate clearly that the displaced Gospel was not a compilation from them, but different' (ii. 157).

The above argument is one mere tissue of fallacies. Theodoret says that Tatian 'cut away' the genealogies, and other passages. From what does Theodoret mean, if not from our Gospels? Why, our author himself, two pages further on, tells us that 'although Theodore, writing in the fifth century, says in the usual arbitrary manner of early Christian writers, that Tatian "excised" from his Gospel the genealogies and certain passages found in the Synoptics, he offers no proof of his assertion, and the utmost that can be received is that Tatian's Gospel did not contain them.' Here the author clearly admits by inadvertence what he had previously denied. For, if Theodoret charges Tatian with excising passages from our Gospels, it is evident that he means his readers to understand that they formed the base of Tatian's work; otherwise there would be no ground for the charge.

Secondly, as Theodoret only brings this one accusation against Tatian's work, it is natural to suppose that this was the sole, or at any rate the chief, reason why he condemned it.

Thirdly, Canon Westcott does *not* point out that 'omissions are natural to a Harmony' in the abstract way implied. He *does* say that Theodoret 'speaks of omissions which were at least in part natural in a Harmony,' meaning, I suppose, that Tatian might leave out the genealogies if he found himself unable to harmonize the versions of Matthew and Luke satisfactorily.

Fourthly, no one, I imagine, has ever supposed that in Tatian's work 'every part of the four Gospels' was retained, if by this phrase is meant the entire text of each of the four Gospels. Where an incident was described by several evangelists, the 'Gospel through Four' would give a text compounded from each, but not the full text of each separately. Such a combined narrative, though it would be longer than any two of our Gospels, would be much more concise than all four together.

Fifthly, there is not the slightest analogy between omissions in the fourth Gospel and Tatian's 'Gospel through Four.' The writer of the former had a perfect right to limit the range of his

narrative as he chose ; the writer of the latter, if he professed to connect and combine the Gospels, as Eusebius says he did, had no such liberty. If he left out material texts respecting the person of Jesus, he suppressed them, and, if he suppressed, denied or questioned them.

Sixthly, ‘the statement that in place of Tatian’s Gospel Theodore “introduced the Gospels of the four Evangelists”’ does not indicate in the least that Tatian’s Gospel was not a compilation from them. Theodore simply tells us that he substituted the Gospels of the four Evangelists for the Gospel of Tatian, i.e. the original Gospels of the Four for their mutilated summary, the Gospel through Four.

We have not, however, yet done with our author, who goes on to declare that ‘the name Diatessaron was not only not given by Tatian himself to the work, but was merely the usual foregone conclusion of the Christians of the third and fourth centuries, that everything in the shape of evangelical literature must be dependent on the Gospels adopted by the Church. Those, however, who called the Gospel used by Tatian the Gospel according to the Hebrews, must have read the work The work was in point of fact found in wide circulation precisely in the places in which, earlier, the Gospel according to the Hebrews was more particularly current’ (ii. 158).

Of course the assertion that the name of the work was not conferred on it by Tatian himself is in flat contradiction to the words of Eusebius. Our author claims, indeed, the support of Epiphanius. ‘It must be observed,’ he writes, ‘that it is not said that Tatian himself gave this Gospel the name of Diatessaron, but, on the contrary, the expression of Epiphanius implies that he did not do so’ (ii. 155). Our author’s nose for implications, so dull when the implications are inconvenient to his theories, is here exquisitely fine. The words of Epiphanius are: ‘And the “Gospel through Four” is said to have been made by him, which some call “according to the Hebrews.”’ *

I am at a loss to know to what our author’s sneer about ‘the usual foregone conclusion of the Christians of the third and fourth centuries’ refers, unless it be to their belief, shared by most recent critics, that Marcion’s Gospel was a mutilated Luke. But the only writers of those centuries who mention what we *know* to have been the Gospel according to the Hebrews never call it ‘the Gospel

* Δέγεται δὲ τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων Εὐαγγέλιον ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ γεγενῆσθαι, ὥπερ κατὰ Ἐβραίους τινὲς καλοῦσι (Haer. xlvi. 1).

through Four' or ascribe it to Tatian, but call it * 'the Gospel according to the Hebrews,' † 'the Gospel existing among the Jews in the Hebrew language,' ‡ 'the Gospel which has come to us in Hebrew characters,' § 'the Gospel according to Matthew,' || 'the Hebrew Gospel,' ¶ 'the Gospel which is written in Hebrew letters,' ¶¶ 'the Gospel according to the Hebrews according to the Apostles, or, as very many [or, most] deem, according to Matthew,' ** 'the Gospel which is written in Hebrew and read by the Nazarenes,' †† 'the Gospel which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use,' ‡‡ 'the Gospel which the Nazarenes use.' Strange that if the Gospel according to the Hebrews were by some ascribed to Tatian and called the Gospel through Four, Eusebius, Epiphanius, and Jerome, who so often refer to it, should either not know this fact or omit to mention it. Strange that Christians of the third and the fourth centuries should give the Gospel according to the Hebrews a title and ascribe to it an origin totally different from the title given and the origin ascribed by their own literary leaders. Strange that they should cast about for a canonical relationship for it, when it was already ascribed to Matthew §§ in the previous century, and in doing so should invest a noted heretic with its authorship, while they gave to a work which was apparently only a variant Matthew, with here and there an affinity to Luke, and |||| which was not as long as either of them, a title implying that it was an amalgamation of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John !

The assertion that 'those who called the Gospel used by Tatian the Gospel according to the Hebrews must have read the work' is, of course, purely arbitrary. The statement, too, that it was 'found in wide circulation precisely in the places in which, earlier, the Gospel according to the Hebrews was more particularly current,' seems to have no more ground than is afforded by the fact that ¶¶ Jerome was allowed to copy the Gospel according to the Hebrews by the Nazarenes in Beroea, who were in the habit of using it. Now Beroea (Aleppo) was forty miles south of Theodoret's

* Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius (4 times), Epiphanius, Jerome (5 times).

† Eusebius.

‡ Eusebius.

§ Epiphanius (twice). Jerome says, 'which is called by very many [or, most] people the original of Matthew.'

|| Epiphanius, Jerome.

¶ Jerome.

** Jerome.

†† Jerome.

‡‡ Jerome.

§§ By Irenaeus.

||| In the Stichometry of Nikephorus (see p. 116) Luke contained 2,600 *οριχοι*, Matthew 2,500, and the Gospel according to the Hebrews, 2,200.

¶¶ *Catal. Script. Eccles.* under 'Matthaeus.' I have quoted and translated the text on p. 18.

cathedral town, and was not included in his diocese, having a bishop of its own. I do not mean to say that the Nazarene Gospel might not also have been used by some people twenty miles or so further north, within the limits of Theodoret's diocese; but I do very strongly object to the statement that the work mentioned by Theodoret was found 'precisely in the places' where the Gospel according to the Hebrews had been 'more particularly current.' The fact of Jerome's having copied that Gospel at Beroea does not even prove that it was 'more particularly current' there; Beroea may have been only the first town where he had the opportunity of copying it. For immediately after arriving in the East he retired for four years to the desert of Chalcis, on the north side of which Beroea was situated, at a distance of only twelve miles from Chalcis itself.

The explanation of the fact that some people called Tatian's Gospel through Four the Gospel according to the Hebrews is obviously that given by Professor Westcott (*Canon*, 319, note):— 'Both books were current in the same countries, and differed from the Canonical Gospels *** by the omission of the genealogies. Few writers out of Palestine could compare the books so as to determine their real differences.' To this let me add that Tatian ††† may even have preferred to use the Aramaic 'Matthew,' the Gospel according to the Hebrews, rather than the Greek one, for his compilation, or ††† he may have used MSS. nearer to it than those on which we now base our text. Upon either view the confusion of his work with the Gospel according to the Hebrews becomes still more easy to understand and excuse.

Before closing this examination it is necessary just to notice a statement by §§§ Victor of Capua that Tatian called his Gospel 'through Five' (*Diapente*). The passage runs as follows:—|||! From his [Eusebius's] history, too, I have found that Tatian, a most learned man and orator of that time, compiled one Gospel out of

*** I only admit this of the Ebionite edition.

††† Especially if he compiled his work after his migration from Rome to Syria.

††† Even some of our extant MSS., as will be seen in the notes to the Fragments, present one or two striking resemblances to the text of the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Tatian, moreover, was the pupil of Justin, whose coincidences with that Gospel will also be noticed, and who certainly used our Gospels, although he may have used the Gospel according to the Hebrews as well. See *Appendix E*, 'Justin's "memoirs of the Apostles."

§§§ Writing about 550 A.D.

||| Ex historia quoque eius comperi quod Tatianus, vir eruditissimus et orator illius temporis, unum ex quatuor compaginaverit Evangelium, cui titulum Diapente imposuit (*Praef. ad Anon. Harm. Evang.*).

four, to which he put the title *Diapente*.' Never has so puzzling an assertion been more recklessly commented on.

First, Professor Westcott (*Canon*, 321, note) says 'If there be no error in his statement that Tatian's Harmony was called *Diapente*, the fifth Gospel alluded to in the name was probably that according to the Hebrews, and the title was given in consequence of the confusion already noticed.' Westcott *seems* to have seen the original passage of Victor of Capua in Credner's *Beiträge*, but he does not quote it, and argues as if he had *not* seen it. For Victor does not say that Tatian's work 'was called' *Diapente*, 'through Five,' but that Tatian himself gave it this title, which quite disposes of the suggestion that 'the title was given' by others 'in consequence of the confusion already noticed' between his work and the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

Secondly, the writer of *Supernatural Religion* (ii. 153) says 'Tatian's Gospel, however, was not only called *Diatessaron*, but, according to Victor of Capua; it was also called *Diapente* ($\delta\alpha\pi\epsilon\nu\tau\epsilon$) "by five," a complication which shows the incorrectness of the ecclesiastical theory of its composition'; and again (ii. 161) 'We have seen that in the sixth century it was described by Victor of Capua as *Diapente*, "by five," instead of "by four." He also does not quote the Latin, makes Victor say merely that it 'was called' *Diapente*, and in the second reference insinuates that it is 'described' as a compilation of five Gospels, by Victor—who on the contrary says that it was a compilation of four.

Thirdly, Dr. Sanday has taken on trust the statement in *Supernatural Religion* (which he gives as his authority), and boldly tells us (*Gospels*, 240) that 'Victor of Capua in the sixth century speaks of Tatian's work as a "Diapente" rather than a "Diatessaron"' . . . (p. 242) The fifth work, alluded to by Victor of Capua, may possibly have been the Gospel according to the Hebrews.' This is the consequence of not looking out references; it would be difficult to mislead the reader more completely as to what Victor *does* say.

I am surprised that no one has perceived that Victor's title 'Diapente' 'through Five' *must* be a mere slip of the pen. From his own express words we know that he was acquainted with the existence and character of Tatian's work from Eusebius, and seemingly (as he gives no other authority) him alone, and from Eusebius's account he distinctly describes it as a combination of *four* Gospels. Eusebius says that Tatian called his work 'Dia-tessaron' 'through Four,' and Victor, copying him, must have intended to say the same. No doubt* when he took down the words of Eu-

* Or, which comes to the same thing, his MS. of Eusebius may have had the

sebius he wrote διὰ δ' for διὰ τεσσάρων, and when working from his own notes translated δ' into πέντε, as if it were the letter for 5 instead of 4. Every one must be aware of making slips of this kind now and then: I can give from my own experience a curiously similar example. In rendering into English verse *Odyss.* v. 70—

Κρήναις δ' ἔξειν πίσυρες ρέον θδατι λευκῷ

Fountains four

In order ranged with sparkling water flowed—

I inadvertently translated 'Fountains five,' and the mistake not only slipped me in MS. but through the printer's proofs. Had Victor of Capua made this particular blunder, no doubt unsuspecting critics would point out that his MS. of Homer must have read not πίσυρες ρέον but πέντ' ἔρρεον.

E. JUSTIN'S 'MEMOIRS OF THE APOSTLES.'

The passage of Jerome quoted on p. 21 has been urged in favour of a theory that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was the same with Justin's 'memoirs of the Apostles.'

I reject this theory, in the first place because I am convinced that Justin used our existing Gospels, whether (as has been suggested) in the form of a harmony or not, and whether (as I am inclined to think) he used any further record or not. I would willingly discuss this subject, but, as it occupies nearly 150 pp. of *Supernatural Religion*, more than 80 in Prof. Westcott's *Canon of the New Testament*, and 50 in Dr. Sanday's *Gospels in the Second Century*, the discussion would seriously delay the present work, besides taking up a most disproportionate amount of its space. I recommend any one who wishes to master the question to read first *Supernatural Religion*, then Prof. Westcott, then *Supernatural Religion* again, and lastly Dr. Sanday.

But, whether or not Justin used our Gospels, I should hold that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was not the same with (though it might be included in) Justin's 'memoirs of the Apostles.'

The crucial proof of this is a passage † in which Justin, after mentioning the 'memoirs of the Apostles,' adds, 'which are called Gospels,' showing that he grouped several evangelio works under this designation. 'This clause,' as Dr. Sanday happily expresses it, 'has met with the usual fate of parenthetical statements which do

short form διὰ δ'. And for that matter the slip of the pen may have been in the MS. itself, which may have given διὰ ε' for διὰ δ'.

† Οἱ γὰρ Ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις δὲ αὐτῶν ἀπομημονεύμασιν, & καλεῖται Εὐαγγέλια.—*Apol.* i. 66.

not quite fall in with preconceived opinions, and is dismissed * as a ‘manifest interpolation, a gloss having crept into the text from the margin.’ When a MS. is found that does not contain the words ‘which are called Gospels,’ the gloss-theory will deserve respect: till then it has not a rag of reason to hide its nakedness.

The writer of *Supernatural Religion* does indeed argue as follows (i. 294):—‘If Justin really stated that the Memoirs were called Gospels, it seems incomprehensible that he should never call them so himself. In no other place in his writings does he apply the plural to them, but, on the contrary, we find Trypho referring to the “so-called Gospel,” which he states that he has carefully read, and which, of course, can only be Justin’s “Memoirs;” and again, in another part of the same dialogue Justin quotes passages which are written “in the Gospel” (*ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ γέγραπται*). The term “Gospel” is nowhere else used by Justin in reference to a written record.’

The explanation is not, however, far to find for any one who will seek it. The entire body of facts known and recorded concerning Jesus was spoken of as ‘the Gospel’; the particular writings which contained portions of it had only lately come to be called ‘the Gospel according to’ such and such a writer. Papias, for instance, in speaking of works which he says Mark and Matthew wrote, does not employ the word; to Mark’s book he gives no particular name, but he calls Matthew’s book ‘oracles.’ He himself wrote a book called ‘Exposition of Dominical Oracles’ (*Δογίων Κυριακῶν Ἐξήγησις*), which, with Bishop Lightfoot (*Cont. Rev.* for Aug. 1875), I believe to mean ‘Exposition of sacred books about the Lord.’ When people spoke of the body of facts narrated in the sacred records, they called it ‘the Gospel,’ when of the records themselves they used the word ‘Oracles’ as Papias, or ‘Memoirs’ as Justin, or some other. But in course of time they got to call them by the name of ‘Gospels,’ and Justin alludes to this growing custom: but for all that he himself preferred to use his own old-fashioned term.

There is, I may add, no reason to suppose that the authorship of the Gospel according to the Hebrews was attributed to the Apostles generally in the 2nd or even 3rd cent. Irenaeus calls it simply ‘that Gospel which is according to Matthew,’ and he wrote

* By the writer of *Supernatural Religion*:—‘The last expression *ἢ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια*, as many scholars have declared, is a manifest interpolation. It is, in all probability, a gloss on the margin of some old MS. which some copyist afterwards inserted in the text.’ *Scholar* is an unfortunate substitute for *critic*, as it conveys the idea that the words are faulty from the point of view of pure ‘scholarship.’

less than 50 years, perhaps only 40, after Justin. Are we to believe that he would have so described a work which in his boyhood † was read on Sundays in Christian assemblies as ‘the Memoirs of the Apostles’?

There are no proofs that Justin used the Gospel according to the Hebrews at all: in two cases he accords with it in certain peculiarities, but these same peculiarities are also found in MSS. of Matthew and Luke which we know to represent a 2nd cent. type of text. In neither of these cases is his agreement with the Gospel according to the Hebrews exact, while in one he does agree verbatim with the MSS. in question. I am not disputing that he may have employed this Gospel among others, but I do say that, with no evidence that he used it at all, it is childish to hold that he used it to their exclusion.

F. ANALYSIS OF THE EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL EVIDENCE FOR AND AGAINST THE GENUINENESS OF JOHN vii. 53–viii. 11.

(i.) EXTERNAL EVIDENCE. (a) *Text of Extant MSS.*

John vii. 53–viii. 11 is contained ‘without trace of suspicion’ (Scrivener) in 7 uncials, DEGHKUT, and 318 cursives, to which may be added the first hands of 3 and the second hands of 9 cursives.

It is omitted by 8 uncials, ΝΒΑCTLX†Δ, and 57 cursives, while 4 other cursives (including Cod. 237, mentioned again below) omit viii. 3–11.

It is ‘obelized,’ i.e. marked as doubtful, in 3 uncials, MSΔ, and 42 cursives (including Cod. 33 and ev-y), and by the second hands of 3 other cursives; while parts of it are so marked in 2 uncials, E (viii. 2–11) and II (viii. 3–11), and 2 cursives (viii. 4–11). In one cursive which contains the passage viii. 12 is also written after vii. 52.

It is written at the end of the Gospel in Cod. 1 and 11 other cursives (including Cod. 237, mentioned above), and part of it (viii. 3–11) is so appended in 4 cursives (including one which had previously omitted the *entire* passage).

It is inserted after vii. 36 in one cursive, and at the end of Luke xxi. by 4 cursives (including Cod. 13 and Cod. 69).

Thus of 459 later authorities (cursive) no less than 129 omit,

† Τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων ή τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν Προφητῶν ἀναγνώσκεται μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ.—*Apol.* i. 67.

‡ X, however, is said by Dr. Burgeson to be a mere commentary (with accompanying text) on the Gospels *as publicly read*.

transfer, or obelize the passage, and among these are the 5 exceedingly important cursivees 1, 13, 33, 69 and ev-y.

Of the 20 earlier MSS. (uncial) no less than 13 omit or obelize it. Among these are the 5 most ancient ones, NB of the 4th cent., and ACT of the 5th cent.; D, the oldest MS. which contains it (5th or 6th cent.), is celebrated for curious additions. The next oldest MS., E (7th or 8th cent.), obelizes part of the passage, and the next, L (8th cent.), omits all of it. The rest are all of the 9th or 10th cent.

(b) *Text of Versions.*

The passage is contained in the Vulgate, the Jerusalem Syriac, the Aethiopic, and later MSS. of the Armenian. The MSS. of the Old Latin are divided, but the evidence for the passage overweighs.

It is omitted by the Italian Recension (i.e. f and q), Cureton's Syriac,* the Peshitta, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Thebaic, the Gothic, and earlier MSS. of the Armenian. The earlier (against the later) Memphitic MSS. are said to want it, and Mr. McClellan (*New Test.*, 720) allows this, but I do not know where the statement is established and prefer to regard the evidence of the Memphitic as uncertain.

The Latin versions, therefor, taken apart from the rest, tell for the passage, the Syriac against it, the Egyptian against it, and the residue against it. The balance of the combined evidence is against.

(c) *Evidence of Early Writers.*

Among the Latin Fathers Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome support it. Ambrose quotes or refers to it 4 times, clearly without any doubt. Augustine does so 6 times, once mentioning it as a peculiarity of John's Gospel, once expounding it verse by verse in his Commentary on John, and once stating that 'some of little

* This version, as published by Cureton, was wanting between John vii. 37 and xiv. 10. But in the autumn of 1870 three more fragments were found, one of which most happily comprises John vii. 37-viii. 19: it leaves out the entire passage before us. The discovery happened after the publication of Tischendorf's last edition (1869), and, strangely enough, Dr. Scrivener was unaware of it when in 1874 he published the 2nd ed. of his *Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*. Mr. Hammond also, in 1876, distinctly states that the Curetonian is defective here. Let me, therefor, say that the two other fragments found are Luke xv. 22—xvi. 12, xvii. 1-23; that in 1872 Prof. W. Wright of Cambridge printed, privately, 100 copies of the Syriac text, one of which is in the British Museum; and that a translation into N. T. Greek will be found in Pt. ii. of Mr. Crowfoot's *Fragmenta Evangelica*. The fact that the Curetonian is not defective here, but nevertheless leaves out the passage, is the more important because it is opposed to its allies D and the Old Latin: we should have supposed *a priori* that the Curetonian would contain the story.

faith, or rather enemies to true faith—I imagine out of fear that impunity of sin was granted to their wives—removed from their MSS. that which the Lord did respecting the forgiveness of the adulteress.' And Jerome, besides inserting it in the Vulgate, says that it was found 'in many both Greek and Latin manuscripts.' Of these, however, Augustine, who was a poor Greek scholar, is probably only a witness to the reading of the Latin copies: in which case his words confirm my belief that the Old Latin had the passage but that the Italian Recension had not. And the words of Jerome imply that the passage was wanting in *most* MSS.

On the other hand, Juvencus in his metrical paraphrase of the Gospel history omits it. Tertullian does not mention it in his treatise *De Pudicitia*, where it is said he must have referred to it had he known it as a genuine portion of the text. Tischendorf adds that Cyprian and Hilary had good occasion to allude to it, had they chosen.

As for the Greek fathers, not one of them before Euthymius (12th century) mentions these verses, and he says that 'in the accurate copies they are either not found or are marked doubtful, wherefor they seem to be an interpolation and addition.' Origen, Chrysostom, Cyril, and Theophylact pass over them in their commentaries, the first three closely connecting viii. 12 with vii. 53. Nonnus omits the story in his poem, and Cosmas does not mention it in the list of incidents peculiar to John. *The Apostolic Constitutions* do refer to it, but without stating its source. Tischendorf calls attention to the fact that Basil, who might well have quoted it, has not done so.

The evidence of the Latin fathers is therefor doubtfully favourable, that of the Greek fathers overwhelmingly opposed to the genuineness of the passage.

(d) *Evidence of the Lectionaries.*

Ambrose speaks of it as a 'Gospel-lesson.' There is evidence of its use in the Greek servicebook as early as the beginning of the 9th century; in no Greek lectionary, however, does it stand as part of the lesson for Pentecost, being always read on the festival of some female saint of doubtful antecedents. The great majority of the Greek lectionaries contain it.†

The evidence from lectionaries is therefor decidedly in favour

† The Jerusalem Syriac lectionary has already been reckoned among the versions. It continues the Pentecostal lesson to viii. 2, but assigns viii. 3–11 to St. Euphemia's day.

of the genuineness of the passage. But this evidence is much later than that to be derived from MSS. versions and fathers; and the singular appropriateness of the story to the history of certain female saints easily accounts for its introduction into the services of the Church.

(e) *Evidence of Scholia.*

A note in the margin of A (9th or perhaps 8th cent.), and a great many cursives, runs thus:—‘The verses marked doubtful are not contained in some copies nor in Apollinaris, but are contained entire in the ancient ones.’ Two other scholiasts say the verses ‘are found in ancient copies’ and that they ‘are not contained in the majority of copies, but are found in the more ancient.’

One scribe (of the 9th cent.) says the passage is ‘not contained in the copies of the present day,’ another that it ‘is found in some copies.’

Two scholiasts pronounce against it, one because it ‘is not found in the more accurate of the copies,’ the other because it is ‘not contained in the majority of copies, nor mentioned by the divine fathers that have written commentaries—I mean John Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria—nor yet by Theodore of Mopsuestia and the rest.’

The evidence to be derived from scholia is therefor divided, but may be thought to tell rather in favour of the passage.

(ii.) INTERNAL EVIDENCE. I feel bound to admit that the force of the internal evidence has been greatly overrated. The following are Alford’s specifications:—

(a) *That John nowhere else mentions the Mt. of Olives.* McClellan (*New Testament*, 724) answers that each of the Synoptists mentions Gennesaret only once. There is no proof, however, that they had due occasion for naming it more frequently, whereas we should certainly have expected to find the Mt. of Olives named in John xii. or xviii., as Matthew and Mark each mention it 3 times and Luke 4 times. Still it may be thought less unlikely that John should name it here only than that he should never name it at all.

(b) *That, when John introduces a new place, it is his habit to give explanations.* McClellan answers that in xviii. 1 the brook Kedron is introduced without explanation, and that in any case the Mt. of Olives was too well known to need it. McClellan’s instance is not conclusive, since ‘the winter-torrent Kedron’ is itself merely mentioned to explain the situation of the garden to which Jesus



withdrew: and ‘the sea of Galilee’ ought not to have needed the addition (vi. 1) of the words ‘which is the sea of Tiberias.’

(c) *That ‘τορεύομαι with εἰς is not found elsewhere in John.’* This is not the fact: it is so found in vii. 35, only 18 verses before.

(d) *That ὄρθρον is not found elsewhere in John.* But it is only found once in Luke’s Gospel, once in Acts, and nowhere else in the N. T., and is a word which one would not expect to find more than once in so short a book.

(e) *That παραγίνομαι with εἰς is not found elsewhere in John.* Imagine one giving as evidence against the genuineness of an English paragraph the fact that it contained the construction ‘came into,’ whereas in the rest of the author’s book no example occurred of ‘came into,’ but only of ‘came’ and ‘came to’! Cf. Matt., who has this construction only once, and Luke, who has it not once in his Gospel and yet 3 times in Acts.

(f) *That John uses λαός elsewhere in a different sense, and would have used ὥχλος here.* But, as John only uses λαός in two other places, it is not just to attribute to him alone among the evangelists an exclusively narrow sense of the word. And in the second place ὥχλος in John never means more than ‘crowd,’ whereas here he may be describing the united impulse of all the people gathered together at the feast of tabernacles. Lastly, 3 uncials and 20 cursives actually read ὥχλος and not λαός, while 7 cursives omit the entire sentence.

(g) *That such an expression as καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς is not found elsewhere in John.* True. But it is found (without αὐτούς) only once in Luke, and McClellan reasonably asks, supposing that Jesus did on occasions sit down and teach, whether it is ‘any more inconsistent with S. John’s style than with S. Luke’s or with any other writer’s once to say so.’ Let me add that D and 7 cursives omit the clause.

(h) *That ‘it is not in John’s manner to relate that Jesus taught them, without relating what He taught.’* But there is a marked instance of his doing so in the previous chapter, vii. 14, ‘Jesus went up into the Temple, and taught.’

(i) *That ‘John does not usually connect with δέ.’* But McClellan has shown from other parts of John the complete fallacy of this argument, and has observed that δέ occurs 204 times in the Gospel as against οὖν 206 times.

(j) *That John never mentions οἱ γραμματεῖς elsewhere, but usually calls the opponents of Jesus οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι or οἱ ἀρχοντες.* It certainly is remarkable that the name *Scribes* occurs nowhere else in this Gospel. McClellan, who paraphrases it by ‘Doctors of the Law,’

says 'But the question was one of the Law.' This answer seems at first fairly satisfactory, but becomes less so when we observe (i.) that there was no dispute about the Law at all: the question was not what the Law, but what Jesus prescribed; (ii.) that in cases where the legality of the acts of Jesus is questioned (v. 10-16, ix. 13-16) the Scribes are not mentioned by John, who speaks of 'the Jews' and 'the Pharisees.' It is true that three cursives, with Coptic and Armenian MSS., read 'the CHIEF-PRIESTS and the Pharisees,' and we cannot prove that this, which admirably suits John's usage, was not the original reading. But the authority for it is slender, and the fact of its being thoroughly Johannine will explain its introduction: that 'chief-priests' was, on the other hand, corrupted into 'scribes' is the less likely because in passages of John where the 'chief-priests' are mentioned 'scribes' is never found as a various reading.

(k) That '*λέγοντιν αὐτῷ ἐκπειράζοντες αὐτὸν* savours much more of the synoptic Gospels than of John.' Clearly, because they contain more incidents which admit of such an expression. The use of the word *πειράζω* is not alien to John, who describes Jesus as *πειράζων*, trying, Philip with a question (vi. 6).

(l) That 'the very fact of their questioning thus, "Moses commanded, . . . but what sayest Thou?" belongs to the last days of the Lord's ministry, and cannot well be introduced chronologically where it here stands.' John, however, clothes the figure of Jesus at Jerusalem at this stage of his career with as much public importance as the Synoptists do in the week previous to his death. And would not the same objection apply equally to iii. 13-17, the account of the cleansing of the Temple?

(m) That John nowhere introduces 'these questions between the law of Moses and Jesus; but the synoptic Gospels often do.' The same might be said of the miracle at Cana (c. ii.) and that of the nobleman's son (c. iv.): miracles which do not serve as the occasion for discourses are quite foreign to the general scope of the Gospel.

(n) That '*πλήν* is only found here in John, Gosp. and Epp.' True, but it is also found once, and once only, in Mark. And it is only found once in the Apocalypse—which, if the Apocalypse was written by the writer of the Gospel, is likewise a proof of its being one of his words.

(o) That '*κατακρίνω* also is not found elsewhere in John, who uses *κρίνω* in its strict sense for it.' Equally true, but here again we have a parallel in Luke, who also uses *κατακρίνω* in two consecutive verses (xi. 31, 32) but nowhere else.

Reviewing these 15 items of the indictment, we find that 3 of them (*c h i*) must be given up as against fact; that 5 (*d e g n o*) are exactly applicable to other Gospels (*e* and *g* are otherwise weak); and that 4 (*f k l m*) are untenable for various reasons. Only 3 are left (*a b j*). I think that these (particularly the last) do afford a presumption against Johannine authorship, though to each of them there is some sort of answer not altogether beneath notice.

To sum up—the external evidence must be held fatal to the genuineness of the passage: the internal evidence, while insufficient of itself to establish the same conclusion, must be taken to confirm it.

G. JESUS BAR-ABBA.

In Matt. xxvii. 16, 17 five cursive MSS. and the Jerusalem Syriac and Armenian versions exhibit the reading ‘Jesus Barabbas’ instead of ‘Barabbas.’ And 21 MSS. contain the following marginal note, variously ascribed to Chrysostom (who, however, is silent on the subject in his Commentary) and Anastasius of Sinai (who flourished toward the end of the 6th cent.):—‘In some very ancient MSS. which I came across I found Barabbas himself also called Jesus, so that in these the question of Pilate ran thus—“Whether of the twain will ye that I release unto you? Jesus Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ?” For, as it seems, Barabbas, which is interpreted “teacher’s son,” was the robber’s sire-name—(Παλαιῶς πάνυ ἀντιγράφοις ἐντυχὼν εἶρον καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Βαραββᾶν Ἰησοῦν λεγόμενον. Οὕτως γοῦν εἶχεν ἡ τοῦ Πιλάρου πεντε ἑκεῖ—Τίνα θέλετε ἀπὸ τῶν δύο ἀπολύτων ὑμῖν, Ἰησοῦν τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἢ Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν; Ως γὰρ ἔοικεν πατρωνυμίᾳ τοῦ ληστοῦ ἦν ὁ Βαραββᾶς, ὅπερ ἐρμηνεύεται διδασκάλου νιός).

But the heaviest external evidence in favour of this reading is furnished by the fact that Origen, according to the Latin of a passage now lost in the Greek, states that ‘In many MSS. it is not contained that Barabbas was also called Jesus, and perhaps rightly, so that the name Jesus would not belong to any sinner’ (In multis exemplaribus non continetur quod Barabbas etiam Iesu dicebatur, et forsitan recte, ut ne nomen Iesu conveniat alicui iniquorum)—*Comm. in Matt.* This of course implies that ‘Jesus Barabbas’ was at that time the reading of most MSS.

The internal evidence in Matthew is to my mind very decidedly in favour of ‘Jesus Barabbas.’ If ‘Barabbas’ alone were the

original reading, why was ‘Jesus’ inserted—a name that would naturally be avoided above all others? Tregelles thinks that in Matt. xxvii. 17 ΥΜΙΝ was accidentally written ΥΜΙΝΙΝ and that another copyist mistook the second ΙΝ for ΙΝ, i.e. *Ιησοῦν*, ‘Jesus.’ Now (1) the argument might be retorted on him that the original reading was ΥΜΙΝΙΝ, then ΥΜΙΝΙΝ, and that finally the second ΙΝ was treated as an accidental repetition and left out; (2) the reading ‘Jesus Barabbas’ first occurs in v. 16, where no such mistake as Tregelles supposes was possible; (3) surely a copyist who had read v. 16 without the word ‘Jesus’ would not have changed ΙΝ to ΙΝ in v. 17 and then altered v. 16, to suit it, but would have seen at once that the two superfluous letters were an accidental repetition and would have struck them out altogether.

There is every reason, on the other hand, why, if ‘Jesus Barabbas’ be the true reading, ‘Jesus’ should have been omitted. The piety of early Christians—ignorant for the most part how common that name formerly was among the Jews—supposed it impossible for ‘a murderer, a revolter, and a robber’ to have had the same circumcision-name as the Saviour: compare the above-quoted words of Origen. In the second place, ‘Barabbas’ might itself be mistaken for a circumcision-name by any one ignorant of Aramaic, and then ‘Jesus’ would be struck out as a supposed accidental insertion. In the third place, ‘Jesus’ might be omitted because absent from other evangelists.

It is true that for a moment Matt. xxvii. 20 (‘But the chief priests and the elders persuaded the crowds that they should ask Barabbas but destroy Jesus’) seems to militate against the theory that Barabbas also bore the name ‘Jesus.’ That verse, however, is not a quotation of words used, but merely the evangelist’s account to his readers.

Note too, from vv. 17, 22, that Pilate says ‘Jesus which is called Christ,’ almost as if there were another Jesus from whom it was needful to distinguish him.

Lastly, if Bar-Abba was *not* named ‘Jesus,’ why do Mark, Luke, and John exhibit so singular an unanimity in withholding his *real* circumcision-name? But, if that name was identical with that of their Master, we can well understand why they withheld it.

Of course the name ‘Jesus’ *may* have been brought in from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, supposing it to have been found there: but two out of the three allies of that Gospel, namely Codex Bezae and the Old Latin, have no trace of it—the third, Cureton’s Syriac, is deficient in this part. Anyhow, if the same man wrote Fr. 27 and Matt. xxvii. 16, 17, he would probably write ‘Jesus Barabbas’ in both places if at all.

H. PROBABLE OR POSSIBLE FRAGMENTS OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS.

I have here included all such evangelic quotations in early writers as seem to me referable with more or less probability to our lost Gospel. The number of *possible* quotations might have been enlarged almost indefinitely (see p. 112), but I have excluded all those for which no better presumption can be urged than a slight divergence from the canonical text. I must, however, explain why I have inserted all the evangelic quotations but one in the so-called Second Epistle of Clement of Rome—a work dating about 130–60 A.D.

The one quotation which I have not admitted is a very peculiar one, with no canonical affinities whatever, and Clement of Alexandria, who quotes it four times, says that it is found in *the Gospel according to the Egyptians*. On the strength of this Hilgenfeld has pitchforked into his edition of the supposed fragments of that Gospel all the remaining evangelic quotations in the Second Epistle of Clement of Rome, entirely regardless of these two facts: (1) that each one of those quotations has a canonical parallel, (2) that this is not the case with any fragment of the Gospel according to the Egyptians.

But, if all the rest of the evangelic quotations in the Second Clementine Epistle correspond to passages in the canonical Gospels, why have I given them here? I have been led to do so by the phenomena which the quotation numbered *Fr. 43* presents. It is most certainly not taken from any of our Gospels; at the same time it partly answers to passages in Matthew and Luke, and has certain likenesses to each; and lastly the correspondence is very far nearer to Matthew than to Luke, because the two passages which both evangelists have in common with it are combined by Matthew into the same discourse of Jesus while Luke separates them into different discourses. In other words, we find in this quotation the three striking features of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, (1) close affinity with Matthew, (2) less close but still marked affinity with Luke, (3) decided independence of both.

Two other of these quotations exhibit unquestionable independence of our canonical Gospels—*Fr. 41* and *Fr. 57*, the latter of which is also found in Irenaeus, who regarded the Gospel according to the Hebrews as Matthew's, but did not accept, and consequently would not quote, any other Gospel outside of our four—though he may have quoted from tradition. I have therefore felt fully justified in placing the rest of the quotations of this author among the *possible* Fragments, but they may equally well be more or less loose

quotations from memory of our present Gospels. It is curious that every one has a parallel in Matthew (although sometimes the likeness to Luke is greater) and that at the same time he speaks of the nations as * ‘hearing from your mouth the Oracles (*τὰ Λόγια*) of God,’ which name ‘the Oracles’ (*τὰ Λόγια*) is that given by Papias to the Aramaic Gospel of Matthew, and that he gives an evangelic quotation as a sample of them. I do not press this, but think it worth mentioning.

I must remind the reader that the author of the Epistle quotes words answering to part of Fr. 16 in a form nearer to them than is presented by any other authority.

I have read some part of Mr. Cotterill’s *Peregrinus Proteus*, in which he tries to show that a considerable number of Greek writings, secular and sacred, the latter including the two Epistles bearing the name of Clement, were the work of a mediaeval forger, or two or more forgers in concert, who went on the plan of using words and phrases picked out of genuine writings but using them in quite different surroundings—a plan which, because Henri Estienne professedly engaged in it as an amusement, is supposed to have been employed (probably by him) to forge the writings in question ‘simply for his own amusement, and for the sake of feeling his own literary power, and from his love of that kind of often innocent deceit which &c. &c.’ That a man should not only forge (from whatever object), but, for the sake of indulging a whim which he might as easily indulge without forging, should wilfully give on every page and in almost every paragraph clues which would lead to his own exposure and to his everlasting infamy, is hard to believe. That, having forged three MSS. of a lost writer

* Τὰ ἔθνη γάρ, ἀκούοντα ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ἡμῶν τὰ Λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς καλὰ καὶ μεγάλα θαυμάζει· ἔτειτα, καταμαθόντα τὰ ἄργα ἡμῶν δτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἔξια τῶν ἥρητων δὲν λέγοντεν, ἔνθεν εἰς βλασφημίαν τρέπονται, λέγοντες εἶναι μῦθοι τινα καὶ πλάνην. “Οταν γάρ ἀκούσωσιν παρ’ ἡμῶν δτι λέγει ὁ Θεὸς ‘Οὐ χάρις ὑμῖν εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ἀλλὰ χάρις ὑμῖν εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἔχθρούς καὶ τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς’—ταῦτα δταν ἀκούσωσιν, θαυμάζουσιν τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς ἀγαθότητος· δταν δὲ θῶσιν δτι οὐ μόνον τοὺς μισοῦντας οὐκ ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλ’ δτι οὐδὲ τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας, καταγελῶσιν ἡμῶν καὶ βλασφημεῖται τὸ ‘Ονομα—‘For the nations, hearing from our mouth the Oracles of God, wonder at them for their beauty and grandeur; then, having learnt our works, that they are not worthy of the words which we say, they turn themselves from this to reviling, saying that it is some myth and will of the wisp. For when they hear from us that God saith “It is no thank to you if ye love them that love you, but it is thank to you if ye love enemies and them that hate you”—when they hear these things they wonder at the over-abounding goodness: but when they see that not only do we not love them that hate us, but not even them that love us, they laugh us down and the Name is reviled.’—xiii.

of the highest interest to all the Christian world (as in the case of the two Clementine Epistles), and having the means of giving immediate publicity to them (as Estienne had) he should yet dispose of them so that he would never enjoy the fruits, mental or pecuniary, of his toilsome deceit—so that indeed not one of these MSS. was printed till centuries after his death—is also hard to believe. That some of the supposed ‘parodies’ are so babyish that one wonders how any man with a man’s brain would find pleasure in making them Mr. Cotterill himself will hardly deny; nor does it seem, as far as I have read, that he has tested the amount of undesigned coincidences of expression in a number of provably genuine writings. To qualify myself to speak decidedly on Mr. Cotterill’s most laborious and ingenious book would claim an amount of time which I cannot spare; but I wish to show that I have not ignored it, and that I have *prima facie* reasons for holding the received belief till those who shall gain the qualification to judge give their judgement to Mr. Cotterill.

As to the passages taken from the *Clementine Homilies*—an Ebionite work of the 2nd or early 3rd cent. quite unconnected with the Clementine Epistles—I have inserted them on the ground that, if they are not mere oral traditions, the Gospel according to the Hebrews was the likeliest non-canonical source for the Ebionite author of the Homilies to borrow from. The common theory that he habitually used a form of the Ebionite Gospel has to face the fact that wherever we can compare his quotations with the Gospel according to the Hebrews, as in the case of Fr. 20 and Fr. 24, he offers no approximation to it but follows the canonical narrative, which in these instances happens to be widely different.

†34. ?

The son and the daughter shall inherit alike.

† Hilgenfeld inserts these quotations in his edition, and seems to have no doubt whatever that they belong to the Gospel according to the Hebrews. As he gives no reason beyond saying that the latter of the two is too unlike the Greek Matthew to have been translated from it, I did not, in face of my own objections, intend to take any notice of them. But, since the Rev. W. H. Lowe in his *Fragment of Talmud Babli Pesachim* and Prof. Rawson Lumby in the *Expositor* for April maintain that they are taken from an Aramaic Gospel, I have reconsidered the question, and feel that they should at least be included among the *possible* Fragments.

The following translation of a story in the Babylonian Talmud (*Shabbath*) I take from Mr. Lowe (p. 68):—Imma Shalom (= *Salome*) was the wife of Rabbi Eliezer [ben Hyrcanus], and the sister of Rabban Gamliel [the younger]. There was in his neighbourhood a certain Pilosfa, who had the name that he would not take a bribe. They wished to have a laugh at him. So she brought him a golden lamp [as a present], they went before him, and she said to him: ‘I wish

35. Matt. v. 17. I am not come to take away from the law of Moses, nor to add to the law of Moses am I come.

that they should apportion unto me of the property of our family.' He [the *Pilosfa*] said to them: 'Apportion it (to her).' He [Rabban Gamli'el, her brother] said to him: 'We have it written (*var. lect.* in the Law), *Where there is a son a daughter does not inherit.*' He answered him: 'From the day that ye were removed from your land the Law of Moses was taken away and another Law given, and in it it is written, *The son and the daughter shall inherit alike.*' Next day he [Rabban Gamli'el], in his turn, brought him a Lybian ass. He [the *Pilosfa*] said to them: 'I have looked further on in the book and it is written in it, *I am not come to take away from the Law of Moses, nor to add to the Law of Moses am I come;* and in it [the Law of Moses] it is written, *where there is a son, a daughter shall not inherit.*' She [Imma Shalom] said to him [pointedly]: 'Let thy light shine like the lamp!' Rabban Gamli'el said to her: 'The ass has come and trodden out the lamp!' [i.e. the second bribe counteracted the effect of the first].

For *Pilosfa* 'philosopher' Mr. Lowe would however read a form of 'episcopos,' 'bishop,' which the reading of the Munich MS. suggests to him, and for 'another Law' he reads, with the Oxford MS. 'the law of the Evangelium.'

The Rabban Gamli'el of the above story was the grandson of the Gamli'el at whose feet Paul sat, and became President of the Sanhedrin. His sister's husband Rabbi Eliezer was one of the most famous Rabbis of the day, but in the Talmud he is said to have been charged before the Roman governor with Christian leanings, and is also said to have quoted with approval a Christian interpretation of Deut. xxiii. 18. And so Mr. Lowe plausibly suggests that his wife's object in bribing the Christian of the story was to counteract her husband's friendliness to Christians. He also points out that Paul, in 1 Cor. vi., directs Corinthian Christians to settle legal disputes before judges chosen from their own body. Internal evidence, therefore, is in favour of the truth of the story. And 'it is impossible,' says Mr. Lowe, 'that the whole should be pure invention—and the citations given from such an imperfect knowledge of the Gospels and Epistles, as may be supposed to have been possessed by the compilers of the Talmud Babli in the ivth and vth centuries—for Rab, who (as we hope to prove on some other occasion) was the vehicle of such traditions, must have brought the story back with him from Palestine to Babylonia. And there it must have been embodied in the Babli (*à propos* of the use of the word נָשָׁה), and the treatment of books which in the estimation of some Jews were semi-sacred) with the same good faith with which hundreds of other stories, brought by him, were inserted. Thus it is but reasonable to consider this as a tradition concerning Rabban Gamli'el, partially corrupted perhaps through process of transmission, but still authentic in its main points.'

It seems to me quite possible that the first of the two quotations may be only a distorted application of Gal. iii. 28, 'There is not male or female: for all ye are one [man] in Christ Jesus.' For Gamli'el's own quotation from the Old Testament is no true quotation, but only an inference from Num. xxvii. 8, 'If a man die, and have no son, then shall ye pass over his inheritance to his daughter.' Or we may call to mind that passage in the Second Clementine Epistle (xii. 2) 'For the Lord himself, having been asked by some one when his kingdom should come, said "When the two shall be one, and the outside as the inside, and the male with the female neither male nor female"—a passage which Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iii. 9, 93) asserts to have been in the *Gospel according to the Egyptians.* But the reference to Galatians is more natural, and we have no

evidence of the existence of the Gospel according to the Egyptians before the time when the Second Clementine Epistle was written—perhaps 60, perhaps 90 years later than what we shall presently see is the likeliest date for this incident.

If, however, we might take as literally true the statement that our first quotation was found in ‘the law of the Evangelium’ or even ‘another law’ it would be impossible to look for its source in Gal. iii. 28. No Christian, assuredly no Jewish Christian, would be likely to speak of an epistle of Paul as superseding the law of Moses. And the statement that the second quotation was ‘further on in the book’ is also against the correspondence of the former with Gal. iii. 28.

As to the second quotation, it is quite close enough to Matt. v. 17, ‘Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfil.’ We know how variously the Gospels report sayings of Jesus: why should we think that the oral tradition of non-Christian Jews would preserve a Christian saying more exactly than the oral tradition of Christian Jews preserved the sayings of Jesus?—more especially when in the former case the interval before commission to writing was, as far as we know, much longer.

Let us now consider the time and place to which the incident should be referred. It must have happened after the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, or at least after Vespasian’s edict of A.D. 72, whereby all the lands of the Jews were put up for sale. And it must have happened before A.D. 123, when Rabban Gamli’el died. But from A.D. 82 to his death Gamli’el was President of the Sanhedrin, and it seems very unlikely that he would compromise the dignity of that post by acting as the story represents. We must therefor look for a date between A.D. 70 and 82. Now the father of Imma and Gamli’el died in A.D. 70, and it is reasonable to suppose that the particular pretext with which they went to the Christian was suggested by their father’s death. So that we can hardly be wrong in dating the incident about A.D. 71–3. The scene was almost undoubtedly Jamnia, whither the Sanhedrin had gone before the siege of Jerusalem, and whether Gamli’el also is known to have gone just after his father’s death.

And now let us consider whether the Christian is likely to have been a Jew or a Gentile. There was indeed a Gentile settlement at Jamnia, but Imma and Gamli’el are far more likely to have chosen a Jewish than a Gentile Christian for an experiment of this kind. And it is to be noted that the Christian seems to have held that the Jews were bound by their law so long as it was physically possible for them to carry out its precepts in full—which was exactly the Judaeo-Christian attitude. Lastly, if he was indeed a ‘bishop,’ it is far more likely that a Jew would be chosen as bishop among a population which was after all mainly Jewish.

If so, Gamli’el would naturally quote to him the Rabbinical inference from Num. xxvii. 8, in Aramaic, and he would as naturally quote in answer an Aramaic Gospel if *there was one to his purpose*. Of course we do not know that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was then written, but if *in the main the work of an Apostle* it probably was; and, if Luke, albeit writing perhaps as many as ten years later, knew ‘many’ Gospels, there is no reason why some of those Gospels and among them the Gospel according to the Hebrews should not have been in circulation at Jamnia before A.D. 70.

If a place in the Matthaeaean text before Matt. v. 17 had to be found for the first quotation, we might connect it with Matt. v. 3 or 10, ‘theirs is the kingdom of the heavens’ or better with Matt. v. 5, ‘they shall inherit the earth.’

The originals of the two quotations are and בֵּית בָּרָא וּבְרִית כְּתָרָא יַרְתָּן and לֹא לְמִיפְתָּח מִן אֲוִירִיתָא רֶמֶשָׁה אֲתִיהִ and לֹא לְאָסֵפָה עַל אֲוִירִיתָא רֶמֶשָׁה אֲתִיהִ

* 36. ? Matt. v. near the end. It is blessed rather to give than to receive.

† 37. Matt. v. 46. [There is] not thank to you if ye love them
Luke v. 32, 35. that love you; but [there is] thank to you if ye
love enemies and them that hate you.

‡ 38. Matt. vi. 24. No servant can serve two masters . . . serve
Luke xvi. 13. both God and mammon.

§ 39. Matt. vi. 33. Ask great things and little things shall be
added to you, and ask heavenly things and earthly
things shall be added to you.

* Acts, xx. 35—μυημονεύειν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, δτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν 'Μακάριον ἐστιν μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν,' and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, that he said "It is blessed rather to give than to receive." The grounds for thinking that this may well have been found in our Gospel are (1) that it occurs in a work written by Luke (2) that Paul was almost certainly familiar with a tradition (see Fr. 29) found in this Gospel.

Compare also Clement of Rome, ii. 1, 'more gladly giving than receiving' (ἥδιον διδόντες ἢ λαμβάνοντες). The date of Clement's epistle is probably 93-7 A.D.

† 'Second Epistle of Clement,' xiii. 4—Λέγει δὲ Θεὸς 'Οὐ χάρις ὑμῖν εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἄγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς· ἀλλὰ χάρις ὑμῖν εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἔχθροὺς καὶ τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς,' 'God saith &c.'

Bishop Lightfoot takes the first part as a loose quotation from Luke vi. 32, 'If ye love them that love you, what manner of thank is there to you?' (Εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἄγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, πολὺ ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν;) and the latter part as a loose quotation from Luke vi. 35, 'But love your enemies . . . and your reward shall be much' (Πλὴν ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἔχθρούς ὑμῶν . . . καὶ ἐσται δὲ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς). He might also have suggested a reminiscence of Luke vi. 28, 'Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you' (τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς).

But compare also Matt. v. 46, 'For, if ye should love them that love you, what reward have ye?' (Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἄγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε;) and 44 . . . 'love your enemies' (ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἔχθρούς ὑμῶν), to which some 2nd cent. authorities, though doubtless from Luke, add 'do good to them that hate you' (τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς).

‡ 'Second Epistle of Clement,' vi. 1—Λέγει δὲ δὲ Κύριος 'Οὐδεὶς οἰκέτης δύναται δυστικούς δουλεύειν.' 'Ἐὰν ἡμεῖς θέλωμεν καὶ Θεῷ δουλεύειν καὶ μαսων, ἀσύμφορον ἥμιν ἐστίν, 'And the Lord saith "No servant can serve two masters." If we wish to serve both God and mammon, it is unprofitable to us.'

Except for the word 'both' the quotations agree verbatim with Luke xvi. 13. In Matt. vi. 24 'No man' is undoubtedly the right reading.

§ Origen, *De Orat.*, § 2—Εἶτε γὰρ δὲ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ 'Ἄτετε τὰ μεγάλα καὶ τὰ μικρὰ ὑμῖν προστεθῆσεται, καὶ αἴτετε τὰ ἐπουράνια καὶ τὰ ἐπίγεια προστεθῆσεται ὑμῖν,' 'For Jesus said to his disciples &c.'

Elsewhere (*Against Celsus*, vii.) he thus alludes to the former part of the saying:—'He [i.e. the Christian] sends up his prayer to God not about common things; for he has learnt from Jesus to seek for nothing little (that is, sensuous), but only *reast things and truly divine*' ('Αναπέμπει οὐ περὶ τῶν τυχόντων τὴν

¶ 40. Matt. vii. 21. Not every one that saith unto me 'Lord, lord' shall be saved, but he that ¶ doeth righteousness.

** 41. Matt. vii. 23. If ye have been gathered with me in my ††¹ Luke xiii. 26-7. bosom and do not my commandments, I will cast you away and will say unto you 'Depart from me; I know you not whence ye are, workers of iniquity.'

εὐχὴν τῷ Θεῷ· ἔμαθε γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μηδὲν μικρὸν, τουτέστιν αἰσθητόν, ζητεῖν, ἀλλὰ μόνα τὰ μεγάλα καὶ ἀληθῶς θεῖα.

This part was quoted before Origen by Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* i. 24, 158—'For he [i.e. Jesus] saith "Ask great things and little things shall be added to you."

He also alludes to it elsewhere (*Strom.* iv. 6, 34). After quoting the latter half of Matt. vi. 32 and the former half of Matt. vi. 33 he says 'for these things are great; but the little things, and appertaining to sustenance, these things shall be added to you' (ταῦτα γὰρ μεγάλα τὰ δὲ μικρά, καὶ περὶ τὸν βίον, ταῦτα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν).

Compare Matt. vi. 33, 'But seek first the kingdom [of God?] and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added to you' (προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν).

The fact of this traditional saying being found in Origen (who used the Gospel according to the Hebrews often) and Clement (who quoted it as Scripture), coupled with the fact of our having a close parallel to the saying in Matthew, give it the highest claim to be considered a fragment of our lost Gospel.

|| 'Second Epistle of Clement,' iv. 2—Λέγει γὰρ 'Οὐ πᾶς δὲ λέγων μοι Κύριε, κύριε' σωθήσεται, ἀλλὰ δὲ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην, 'For he saith &c.'

¶ 'Righteousness' is found 7 times in Matthew, never in Mark, twice in John, once in Luke, 4 times in Acts. 'To do righteousness' is found in Matt. vi. 1 according to the true and now accepted reading, 'to work righteousness' is also found in Luke x. 35.

** 'Second Epistle of Clement,' iv. 5—Εἶπεν δὲ Κύριος 'Εὰν ητε μετ' ἐμοῦ συνηγμένοι ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ μου καὶ μὴ ποιῆτε τὰς ἐντολὰς μου, ἀποβαλὼ ὑμᾶς καὶ ἔρω 'Τράγετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· οὐκ οἴδα ὑμᾶς πόθεν ἔστε, ἐργάται ἀνομίας,' 'The Lord said &c.'

Matt. vii. 23 has 'And then will I avow to them that "I never knew you: go away from me, ye that work iniquity"' (Καὶ τότε διμολογήσω αὐτοῖς οἵτις 'Οὐδέποτε ξῆγων ὑμᾶς· ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν').

Luke xiii. 26-7 has 'Then shall ye begin to say "We have eaten in front of thee and drunk, and thou hast taught in our streets." And he shall say "I say to you, I know you not whence ye are; stand away from me all that work iniquity" (Τότε ἀρξεσθε λέγειν 'Ἐφάγομεν ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ ἐπίομεν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἡμῶν ἔδιδαξας.' Καὶ ἔρει 'Λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐκ οἴδα ὑμᾶς πόθεν ἔστε· ἀπόστητε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τάντας ἐργαζόμενοι ἀνομίαν').

Now the words 'If ye have been gathered with me in my bosom' seem to me to be conceivably derived from a source akin to that of Luke's words 'we have eaten in front of thee and drunk.' At an Oriental meal the company lay on couches, several on a couch, the head of one in front of the breast of another,

¹ For note see next page.

*42. Matt. ix. 13. I came not [*or, am not come*] to call just but
 Mark. ii. 17. sinners.
 Luke v. 32.

†43. Matt. x. 16, 28. (1) ‡ ‘Ye shall be as § lambkins in midst of
 Luke x. 3, xii. 4. wolves.’

(2) And Peter answered him and saith ‘If
 then the wolves rend the lambkins asunder?’

(3) Jesus said to Peter ‘Let not the lambkins
 after they are dead fear the wolves.’ || And do ye

and this is what is meant by John xiii. 23, the proper rendering of which is
 ‘There was lying in the bosom of Jesus one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved.’
 Viewed in the light of Luke’s version one would conjecture that the words ‘If
 ye have been gathered with me in my bosom’ *may* mean ‘If ye have eaten and
 drunk in front of me.’ It is just worth remarking that the word which I have
 rendered ‘gathered’ is one also applied to drawing close at a dinner-table, for an
 instance of which the reader may turn to *Fr.* 52.

† Found 3 times in Luke, twice in John, never in Mark or Matthew. See
 particularly Luke xvi. 22–3, where Lazarus is in Abraham’s bosom.

* ‘Second Epistle of Clement,’ ii. 4—Καὶ ἐτέρα δὲ γραφὴ λέγει ὅτι: ‘Οὐκ ἥλθον
 καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλὰ ἄμαρτωλους.’ ‘And another Scripture also saith that &c.’
 The agreement is verbatim with Mark, but in Matthew ‘For’ is added, and Luke
 (who presents not ἥλθον but ἔλθηνθα) adds ‘to repentance.’

† ‘Second Epistle of Clement,’ v. 2—Λέγει γάρ δὲ Κύριος (1) “Ἐσεσθε ὡς ἄρνια
 ἐν μέσῳ λύκων.” (2) Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ δὲ Πέτρος αὐτῷ λέγει: ‘Ἐὰν οὖν διασπαρδέσωσιν
 λύκοι τὰ ἄρνια;’ (3) Εἶπεν δὲ Ἰησοῦς τῷ Πέτρῳ ‘Μή φοβεῖσθωσαν τὰ ἄρνια τοὺς
 λύκους μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτά. Καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ φοβεῖσθε τοὺς ἀποκτέννοντας ὑμᾶς καὶ
 μηδὲν ὑμῖν δυναμένους ποιεῖν. (4) Ἄλλὰ φοβεῖσθε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ὑμᾶς
 ἔχοντα ἔξουσίαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος τοῦ βαλεῖν εἰς Γέενναν πυρός,’ ‘For the Lord
 saith &c.’

‡ Found in John xxi. 15 and 29 times in the Apocalypse (always rendered
 ‘lamb’), but nowhere else in the N.T.

§ Matt. x. 16, ‘Behold I send you forth as sheep in midst of wolves’ (*Ιδοὺ*
 ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς πρόβατα ἐν μέσῳ λύκων). Luke x. 3 the same except that for
 ‘sheep’ we have ‘lambs’ (*κρένας*).

|| Matt. x. 28, (3) ‘And fear not at them that kill the body but cannot kill the
 soul. (4) But fear rather him who can destroy both soul and body in Gehenna’
 ((3) Καὶ μὴ φοβεῖσθε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτενύοντων τὸ σῶμα, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν μὴ δυναμένους
 ἀποκτεῖναι. (4) Φοβεῖσθε δὲ μᾶλλον τὸν δυνάμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα ἀπολέσαι
 ἐν Γεέννῃ).

Luke xii. 4, (3) ‘And I say to you my friends, fear not at them that kill the
 body and after that have not anything left to do. (4) But I will show you whom ye
 may fear—fear him who after having killed hath authority to cast in into the Ge-
 henna’ ((3) Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν τοῖς φίλοις μου, μὴ φοβηθῆτε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτενύοντων τὸ σῶμα
 καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μὴ ἔχοντων πειρασθέτερόν τι ποιῆσαι. (4) Τοδείξω δὲ ὑμῖν τίνα
 φοβηθῆτε—φοβηθῆτε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτεῖναι ἔχοντα ἔξουσίαν ἔμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν
 Γεένναν).

‘And can do nought unto you,’ ‘after ye are dead,’ ‘hath authority,’ and

not fear them that kill you and can do nought unto you.

(4) But fear him who after ye are dead hath authority over soul and body to cast into ¶ Gehenna of fire.

**44. Matt. x. 32. Him that confesseth me in face of men, I will confess him in face of my Father.

††45. Matt. xi. 29. Ye shall find rest.

§§46. Matt. xii. The same day having beholde[n] a man working on the Sabbath he said to him '||| Man, if thou knowest what thou dost, blessed art thou: but, if thou knowest not, thou art ¶¶ accursed and *** a transgressor of the law.'

†††47. ? Matt. xiii. 11. Keep the mysteries for me and for the sons of my house.

'cast into' are nearer to Luke: 'But fear him who,' 'over soul and body,' to Matthew.

¶ Matthew uses 'the Gehenna of the fire' twice, and Mark once. He uses 'the Gehenna' once, Mark twice, Luke once. He also uses 'Gehenna' without the article 3 times—the others not at all.

** 'Second Epistle of Clement,' iii. 2—Δέγει δὲ καὶ Αὐτὸς 'Τὸν διμολογήσαντα μὲν ἄνθρωπον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, διμολογήσω αὐτὸν ἐνάπιον τοῦ Πατρός μου, 'And Himself too saith &c.' Matthew has 'Every one therefor who shall confess in me before men, I also will confess him before my Father which is in [the] heavens' (Πᾶς οὖν θεστος διμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοι ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, διμολογήσω καγὼ αὐτὸν ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς).

†† 'Second Epistle of Clement,' vi. 7—'For doing the will of Christ we shall find rest' (Ποιοῦντες γὰρ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Χριστοῦ εὑρίσκουμεν ἀνάπαυσιν).

§§ D has this after Luke vi. 4. The Greek is Τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ θεασμένος τινα ἐργάζομεν τῷ σαββάτῳ ἐπένειν αὐτῷ 'Ανθρώπε, εἰ μὲν οἶδας τί ποιεῖς, μακάριος εἶ· εἰ δὲ μὴ οἶδας, ἐπικαρδίατος καὶ παραβάτης τοῦ νόμου.' It may easily be, or may correspond with, a fragment of the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Its source, the Codex Bezae, and its occurrence in a text of Luke favour the supposition, and we know from Fr. 15 that our Gospel did actually contain a narrative answering to (and in some respects fuller than) Matt. xii. 10–13, the parallel passage to Luke vi. 6–10.

||| This form of address is found in Fr. 20 and thrice in Luke.

¶¶ The particular Greek word is found only twice in the N. T.—in two quotations by Paul, in one of which it is borrowed from the Septuagint: but the very similar ἐπάρπατος is found once in John.

*** 'A transgressor of law' is found in Rom. ii. 25, 27 and James ii. 11.

††† Clementine Homilies, xix. 20, Μεμνήμεθα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ διδασκόλων ὃς ἐντελλόμενος ἐπένειν ἡμῖν 'Τὰ μυστήρια ἐμοι καὶ τοῖς νιοῖς τοῦ οἴκου μου φυλάξατε,' 'We remember our Lord and teacher that he said to us as a command "Keep &c."'

*48. Matt. xv. 8. This people honoureth me with the lips, but
Mark vii. 6. its heart is far off from me.

†49. Matt. xvi. 26. For what [is] the profit if one gain the entire
Mark viii. 36. world and lose his soul?
Luke ix. 25.

‡50. Matt. xviii. 7. The good must come, but blessed [is] he
Luke xvii. 1. through whom it cometh: in like wise need [is]
that the evil come, but woe [to him] through
whom it cometh.

So also Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.*, v. 10, ‘He [*i.e.* the author of the *Epistle of Barnabas*] means “For it was not from grudgingness that the Lord commanded in some [*or, a certain*] Gospel *My mystery [is] for me and for the sons of my house*” (*Οὐ γάρ φθονῶν, φησι, παρήγγειλεν δὲ Κύριος ἐν τινὶ Εὐαγγελίῳ ‘Μυστήριον ἔμοι καὶ τοῖς νιοῖς τοῦ οἰκου μοῦ’*).

The Ebionite Theodotion rendered in Is. xxiv. 16 ‘My mystery [is] for me, my mystery [is] for me and mine’ (*Τὸ μυστῆριόν μον ἔμοι καὶ τοῖς ἔμοις*). His version was made in the 2nd cent. and it is of course possible that the interpretation may have been much older.

I have compared this fragment with the verse in Matthew which says ‘Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given.’

* ‘Second Epistle of Clement,’ iii. 4—‘Ἐν τίνι δὲ αὐτὸν δμολογοῦμεν; Ἐν τῷ ποιεῖν δὲ λέγει καὶ μὴ παρακοειν αὐτῷ τῶν ἐντολῶν καὶ μὴ μόνον χείλεσιν αὐτὸν τιμᾶν, ἀλλ’ ἐξ δλης καρδίας καὶ ἐξ δλης διανόας. Λέγει δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ Ὡσαΐᾳ ‘Ο λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χείλεσι με τιμᾷ, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτοῦ πόρρω ἀπεστιν ἀπ’ ἔμοι,’ ‘And wherein do we confess him? In doing what he saith and not turning our ears from his commandments, and in honouring him not with our lips only but out of entire heart and out of entire mind. And he saith also in Isaiah “This people honoureth me with the lips, but its heart is far off from me.”’ The word ‘also’ seems to show that our author found an injunction against mere lip-honour somewhere else, and I can only assume that he alluded to the use by Jesus (Matt. xv. 8, Mark vii. 6) of the prophecy in Isaiah.

It is moreover quite certain that he quoted that prophecy from a Gospel-version and not from the Septuagint. From the latter it differs widely, but from Matt. xv. 8 only in *αὐτῷ* for *ἀβρῶν* and *ἀπεστιν* for *ἀπέχεται*, the literal rendering of that verse being ‘This people honoureth me with the lips, but their heart is far off from me.’ Mark vii. 6 agrees with Matthew except that it has *οὗτος δὲ λαὸς* for the more unusual *δὲ λαὸς οὗτος*.

† ‘Second Epistle of Clement,’ vi. 2—Τί γάρ τὸ δόφελος ἔάν τις τὸν δλον κόσμον κερδίσῃ, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν ζημιώθῃ; Matthew has ‘For what shall a man be profited if he gain the world entire and lose his own soul’ (Τί γάρ ὁφεληθήσεται οὐθωπός ἔάν τὸν κόσμον δλον κερδίσῃ, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν ζημιώθῃ). Mark is not quite so like, and Luke much less so. I must not for a moment be understood as suggesting that such slight variations indicate another source than our canonical Matthew.

‡ Clementine Homilies, xii. 29—‘Ο τῆς ἀληθείας προφήτης ἔφη ‘Τὰ δγαθὰ ἐλθεῖν δεῖ· μακάριος δὲ, φησιν, δι’ οὐδὲ ἔρχεται· δμοις καὶ τὰ κακὰ ἀνάγκη ἐλθεῖν, οὐαὶ δὲ δι’ οὐδὲ ἔρχεται,’ ‘The prophet of truth said &c.’

Matthew has ‘For need is that the stumbling-blocks come, only woe to the man

§ 51. Matt. xviii. 11. To save that which was perishing.
Luke xix. 10.

|| 52. Matt. xx. after (1) But do ye seek from little to wax great,
v. 28.
Luke xiv. 8-11.

through whom the stumbling-block cometh' (*Ἄναγκὴ γάρ ἔστιν ἐλθεῖν τὰ σκάνδαλα, πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δὲ οὐ τὸ σκάνδαλον ἔρχεται*). Luke has 'For it is impossible that the stumbling-blocks should not come, but woe [to him] through whom they come' (*Ανέδεκτόν ἔστιν τοῦ τὰ σκάνδαλα μηδὲ ἐλθεῖν, οὐαὶ δὲ δι' οὐ ἔρχεται*).

§ 'Second Epistle of Clement,' ii. 7, after the quotation given above at Fr. 42 —*Τοῦτο λέγει διτὶ δεῖ τοὺς ἀπολλυμένους σῶσειν. Ἐκεῖνο γάρ ἔστι μέγα καὶ θαυμαστόν—οὐ τὰ ἔστωτα στηρίζειν, ἀλλὰ τὰ πίπτοντα· οὗτοι καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἡθέλησε σῶσαι τὰ ἀπολλύμενα, 'He means this, that he ought to save those who are being lost. For it is that which is great and wonderful—not to establish that which stands but that which is falling: so also Christ willed to save that which was perishing.' I do not regard this as a necessary allusion to the words of Jesus in Matt. xviii. 11 and Luke xix. 10, but it may be derived from them.*

Luke xix. 10 has 'For the son of man came to seek and save that which was perished' (*σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός*). Matt. xviii. 11 has 'For the son of man came to save that which was perished' (*σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός*).

Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott-and-Hort omit Matt. xviii. 11 as an interpolation from Luke. It is omitted by NB, the Sahidic and Coptic versions, Origen (seemingly), Eusebius, Juvencus, Hilary, and Jerome. It is found in D and all MSS. (seemingly) but six, the Old Latin, Italic Recension, Vulgate, Curetonian and Peshitta Syriac, and Chrysostom. Alford retains it in brackets.

If it were genuine I do not see how its disappearance is to be accounted for (certainly not by '*homoioteleuton*'), and am inclined to set it down as an early marginal note from Luke, or possibly even from the Gospel according to the Hebrews since D, the Old Latin, and the Curetonian support it. It certainly goes with the parable of the lost sheep better to my mind than with the story of Zacchaeus.

|| This passage is added after Matt. xx. 28 by the Curetonian Syriac, D, and the Old Latin. The Curetonian Syriac as rendered by Cureton is as follows:— (1) But you, seek ye that from little things ye may become great, and not from great things may become little. (2) Whenever ye are invited to the house of a supper, be not sitting down in the honoured place, lest should come he that is more honoured than thou, and to thee the Lord of the supper should say, Come near below, and thou be ashamed in the eyes of the guests. (3) But if thou sit down in the little place, and he that is less than thou should come, and to thee the Lord of the supper shall say, Come near, and come up and sit down, thou also shalt have more glory in the eyes of the guests.

D has (1) 'Τμεῖς δὲ ἅγτεῖτε ἐκ μεικροῦ αὐξῆσαι καὶ ἐκ μείζανος ἔλαττον εἶναι. (2) Εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ καὶ παρακληθέντες δειπνῆσαι μὴ ἀνακλείνεσθαι εἰς τοὺς ἔξέχοντας τόπους, μήποτε ἐνδοξέτερός σου ἐπελθῆ καὶ προσελθὼν δειπνοκλήτωρ εἰπῆ σοι "Ἐτι κάτω χώρε," καὶ κατασχυθῆσῃ. (3) Εάν δὲ ἀναπεσῆς εἰς τὸν ἥπτον τόπον, καὶ ἐπελθῆ σου ἥπτων, ἔρει σοι δειπνοκλήτωρ "Σύναγε ἐπὶ ἄνω," καὶ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο χρήσιμον. The English of which is:—(1) But do ye seek } from little to wax
great and (sic) from greater to be a less. (2) And entering in and having been bidden
to sup, [seek] not to lie upon the chief places, lest ever a more honourable than
thou come afterward and having come up the supperbidder say to thee 'Make

and * not from greater to become less.

(2) And, when ye are bidden to the house of a supper,† not to lie upon the chief places, lest there come afterward a more honourable than thou and the lord of the supper having come up say to thee

room still below,' and thou be ashamed. (3) But, if thou lie upon the lesser place and there come afterwards a lesser than thou, the super bidder will say to thee 'Draw in higher,' and this shall be of service to thee.

The Old Latin MSS. give substantially the same version as D, with a host of minor variations of Latinity among themselves which seem to show that the passage was in many cases translated independently by the copyists and was not found in the Latin MSS. before them. But there is no known MS. of the true Old Latin (as distinguished from the Italian recension) which does not contain the passage. There is only one variation of the slightest importance: the Codex Palatinus (*e*, 5th cent.) ends almost exactly as the Curetonian Syriac, 'and then shall there be to thee glory before the guests'—*et tunc erit tibi gloriam coram discubentibus* (seemingly altered from a former *et tunc habebis*)—'and then shalt thou have'—etc.). All the MSS. render *γνέσθε* by *quaeritis* 'ye seek' not *quaerite* 'seek ye.'

The passage is paraphrased by Juvencus (4th cent.) in his metrical version of the Gospels, he also rendering 'ye seek.' And from marginal notes in MSS. it seems to have been known to Hilary in the same century.

The margin of two Syriac MSS., one of the Peshitta version and one of the Philoxenian, contains the passage in Syriac answering as closely as may be to the text of D, with the note that 'it is found in Greek MSS. in this place, and has therefor been added by us here also.'

The passage is very like Luke xiv. 8-11: but the difference between (1) and Luke xiv. 11 is far too great to admit of our supposing that the one is a corrupt memorial version of the other. The grounds for supposing that it may be a fragment, or may answer to a fragment, of the Gospel according to the Hebrews are (1) that it is found in some texts of Matthew (2) that it is found in the precise group of texts—the Curetonian Syriac, D, and the Old Latin—which elsewhere show an affinity with the Gospel according to the Hebrews (3) that it has a Lucan counterpart.

The text from which I translate is a mixed one of my own compilation. It does not pretend to anything like certainty; indeed, unless I were a Syriac scholar and well acquainted with the peculiarities of the Curetonian, it would be impossible for me to give an authoritative opinion as to the comparative merit of some of its readings and those of D.

* All authorities except the Curetonian omit 'not.' The Greek *γνέσθε* will then mean either 'do ye seek' or 'ye seek,' and all the Latin translators take it in the latter sense. But I cannot doubt that the Curetonian is right, the sense being incomparably better.

† The Greek words here and in (3) are those which are paraphrased into 'sit down' by the translators of the Authorized Version wherever they occur. The company lay on long couches, and the paraphrase 'sit down,' besides obliterating from the New Testament the trace of a Jewish custom and substituting an English one in its place, entirely conceals the meaning of John xiii. 28 and introduces a physical impossibility into Luke vii. 38.

'Make room lower' and thou be ashamed in the eyes of the guests.

(3) But, if thou lie upon the lesser place and there come afterward a lesser than thou, the lord of the supper will say to thee 'Draw in higher' and thou shalt have more glory in the eyes of the guests.

‡53. Matt. xxii. 37. Out of entire heart and out of entire mind.

Mark xii. 30.

Luke x. 27.

§54. Matt. xxiv. 5, 11. False Christs, false prophets, false apostles, [schisms ?], heresies, loves of rule.

† 'Second Epistle of Clement,' iii. 4, quoted under *Fr.* 48. These words must not be taken as a direct allusion to the Septuagint of Deut. vi. 5, which has not the words 'out of entire heart,' but as a reference to the quotation of that verse as recorded in Matt. xxii. 37, Mark xii. 30, Luke x. 27, in connexion with which, it may be added, the word 'commandment' used by our author is also found.

Matthew has 'in thy entire heart and in thy entire soul and in thy entire mind' (*ἐν δλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν δλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν δλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου*). Mark has 'out of thy entire heart and out of thy entire soul and out of thy entire mind and out of thy entire strength' (*ἐξ δλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ δλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ δλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ ἐξ δλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου*). Luke has 'out of thy entire heart and in thy entire soul and in thy entire strength and in thy entire understanding' (*ἐξ δλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐν δλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν δλῃ τῇ ἰσχύᾳ σου καὶ ἐν δλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου*).

The preposition 'out of' would seem to point to Mark or Luke rather than Matthew; but 'out of the heart' is a favourite expression with our author, and the short form of his reference is nearest to Matthew.

§ Clementine Homilies, xvi. 21, "Ἐσονται γὰρ, ὡς ὁ Κύριος εἶπεν, ψευδαπόστολοι, ψευδεῖς προφῆται, αἵρετεις, φιλαρχίαι, 'For there shall be, as the Lord said, false apostles, false prophets, heresies, loves of rule.'

Cf. Justin, *Dial.*, 35, *εἰπε γὰρ . . .* "Ἐσονται σχίσματα καὶ αἵρετεις," 'For he said "There shall be schisms and heresies." ' Cf. *Dial.*, 51, 'And in the between time of his coming, as I said before, he declared beforehand that there should be heresies and false prophets in his name' (*Καὶ ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ χρονῷ, ὡς προέφην, γενήσεσθαι αἵρετεις καὶ ψευδαπόφῆτας ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ προεμήνυσε*).

The writer of *Supernatural Religion*, after Credner (seemingly), suggests that this prophecy is referred to by Paul in 1 Cor. xi. 18-19, 'I hear that schisms (*σχίσματα*) exist among you, and in some part I believe it—for there must be heresies also (*καὶ αἵρετεις*) among you, that the proved ones may become manifest among you.' This is ingenious.

Hegesippus, whom we know to have used the Gospel according to the Hebrews, speaks of 'false Christs, false prophets, false apostles' (*ψευδόχριστοι, ψευδοπροφῆται, ψευδαπόστολοι*) but not in such a way as to imply that he was quoting.

The Apostolic Constitutions, vi. 13, say 'For these are false Christs and false

156 *The Gospel according to the Hebrews.*

*55. Matt. xxiv. near For in such as I find you in such will I also the end. judge you.

prophets and false apostles, deceivers and corrupters' (*Οὗτοι γάρ εἰσι ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται καὶ ψευδαπόστολοι, πλάνοι καὶ φθορεῖς*).

For the 'lovings of rule' cf. Clement of Rome, xliv. i, 'And our Apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there woudl be strife over the name of the bishopric' (*Kαὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστοῦ διὰ τούς ἦσσαν ἐπὶ τοῦ δύναμας τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς*).

I am not in the least satisfied that any such *single* passage as the above occurred in any evangelic writing: the phraseology of the Clementine Homilies is quite consistent with the theory that only the *sense* of various prophecies of Jesus is being given, but that the word 'heresies' was in some Gospel or other put into the mouth of Jesus is probable from the double coincidence of Justin.

* Justin, *Dial.*, 47—'Ο ἡμέτερος Κύριος Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· "Ἐν οἷς ἀν ὑμᾶς καταλέβω, ἐν τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ,"' Our Lord Jesus Christ said &c.'

Clement of Alexandria (*Quis dives § 40*) has slightly different Greek words—'*Ἐφ' οἷς γάρ ἀν εἴρω ὑμᾶς, φησίν, ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ,*' 'For in such as I find you, he saith, in such will I also judge you.' But he attributes them to God the Father.

In the earlier half of the 5th cent. Nilus writes "For such as I find thee such will I judge thee" saith the Lord ('Ολον γάρ εἴρω σε, τοιοῦτον σε κρινῶ φησίν δὲ Κύριος')—Anastasius, *Quæsti.* 3, p. 34.

Johannes Climakos, in the latter half of the 6th cent., attributes to Ezekiel the words "In what I find thee, in it will I also judge thee" said God ('Ἐν φέρω σε, ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ κρινῶ σε' εἶπεν δὲ Θεός')—*Scala Paradisi, Grad.* vii. p. 159.

At the end of the 8th cent. Elias, metropolitan of Crete, writes 'For it hath been said by God through some one of the prophets "In what I find thee, in such soothly will I also judge thee"' (*Εἴρηται γάρ ὅτι τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τινος τῶν προφητῶν "Ἐν φέρω σε, ἐν τούτῳ δὴ καὶ κρινῶ σε"*)—Leunclavius, *Jus Graeco-Romanum*, 337.

Mr. Dodd refers to the fragment on Hades once falsely attributed to Josephus and translated by Whiston among Josephus's works. Whiston also published in 1737 a little treatise on the fragment, and from this treatise I find that the text he translated is taken from p. 306 of David Humphreys's translation of Athenagoras, 1714; and that Humphreys says his text is copied from a MS. left by Grabe. I mention these things because I lost hours in trying to find the Greek—which is '*ἐφ' οἷς ἀν εἴρω ὑμᾶς ἐπὶ τούτοις κρινῶ παρ' ἔκαστα' βοῇ τὸ Τέλος ἀπότιτων*' ('In such as I find you, in such will I judge you in everything' saith the End of all)—for I found no modern editions containing the tract on Hades at all, and no old ones which did not stop short of the section containing this quotation.

Grabe speaks of 'others' as quoting these words without naming their source—of whom he mentions only Auctor Testamenti XL Martyrum Sebastenorum in Lambecius's *Comment. de Bibl. Vindob.* lib. iv. p. 99, who says '*Ἐν φέρω σε, φησίν, ἐν τούτῳ καὶ κρινῶ* (Lambecius *κρίνω*) *σε,*' 'For in what I find thee,' he saith, 'in such will I [Lambecius 'do I'] also judge thee.'

Johannes Climakos evidently looked on these words as a quotation from Ezek. xxiv. 14 (Septuagint version), "According to thy ways and according to thy thoughts will I judge thee" saith the Lord.'

†56. Matt. xxv. ? Do ye become proved †¹ bankers.
 before v. 14 or
 after v. 30.

As given by Justin they might be rendered ‘For among such as I find you, among such will I also judge you’ i.e. ye shall be judged by your companions.

The grounds for conjecturally assigning them to our lost Gospel are that they are found in one Father who has certain affinities with it and in another who quotes it as Scripture. I annex it to the parable of the servant who ‘shall begin to smite his fellow-servants and to eat and drink with the drunken,’ and whose lord shall come unexpectedly and punish him.

† Γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπέζιται. In 1 Thess. v. 21 we have ‘And prove (δοκιμάσετε) all things, hold fast the good,’ and Cyril of Alexandria (who died 444 A.D.) prefixes these words to that text, ascribing them to Paul (δι μακάριος Παῦλος φησι, the blessed Paul saith—*Comm. on Is. iii. 3*). Pamphilus (who died in 309), Basil (who died in 380), and Cyril of Jerusalem (who died in 388) similarly prefix them to it, though without any ascription of authorship: see Pamphilus, pref. to *Apology for Origen* (extant in a Latin translation only); Basil on Is. i. 22, iii. 2, v. 20; and Cyril, *Catech.* vi. 36. Dionysius of Alexandria (writing about 256) calls them an utterance of an ‘Apostolic voice’ (Ἀποστολικῆ φωνῆ): see Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 7, § 3. Clement of Alexandria, who refers to them four times (*Strom.* i. 28, ii. 4, vi. 10, vii. 15), says once ‘the Scripture . . . counseleth (ἡ γραφὴ . . . τραπεῖται) “but become proved bankers, proving out some things, but holding fast the good”’ (i. 28), and elsewhere (vii. 15) he alludes to them immediately after a reference to Paul, and follows the allusion by words which appear to be a free paraphrase of the passage in Thessalonians—‘discerning the genuine coin of the Lord from the forgery.’

The work known as *Πίστις Σοφία* (middle of 3rd cent.?) represents Jesus as saying ‘I have said to you of old “Be ye as wise bankers,” that is take the good, cast out the evil.’ This work is in Coptic: the original will be found on p. 220 of Schwartze and Petermann’s edition, Berlin, 1851 (I see the word ΤΡΑΠΕΖΕΙΤΗΣ), and their Latin translation (p. 353) is ‘Respondens σωτηρος dixit Mariae: dixi vobis olim: Estote sicut sapientes τραπεζιται, scilicet bonum suscipe, malum elicite.’

Chrysostom (who died in 407) also quotes the words in connexion with the passage in Thessalonians, in his sermon *On Reading Acts in Pentecost* § 2: but I think the reader will agree that he implies that they were separate texts by different writers—he says ‘For on this also He } saith “Do ye become proved it } bankers,” not that ye may stand on the marketplaces and count silver coins, but that ye may try words with all exactness. For this cause the Apostle Paul also saith “Prove all things, but hold fast the good only.”’ It is a little doubtful whether or not ‘God’ (δι Θεός), the last person named, is the subject to the first ‘saith,’ or whether as in another place in the same sermon ‘Scripture’ is meant: but that does not affect the apparent separation of authorship.

No MS. or version of Thessalonians has the slightest trace of our fragment. And it is easy to see how the connexion arose: the word δόκιμοι, ‘proved,’ called to mind the verb δοκιμάζειν, ‘to prove,’ the technical term for testing the purity of metals, used in the verse of Thessalonians.

The first writers to quote our fragment are the Ebionite author of the Clementine Homilies somewhere about the middle of the 2nd cent., who quotes it three

¹ For note see p. 159.

times (ii. 51, iii. 60, xviii. 20), each time attributing it to Jesus (e.g. 'our teacher said'—διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν Ελεύθερος, ii. 51); and the Gnostic Apelles (3rd quarter of 2nd cent.?), who, according to Epiphanius (*Haer.* xliv. 2), attributed it to Jesus and 'the Gospel'—'he said in the Gospel' (ἔφη ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ).

Origen refers to our fragment no fewer than 11 times (*Hom. iii in Lev.*, xii (soon after middle) and xix (near end) in *Ier.*, ii in *Ezech.*, *Comm. in Matt.* xvi. 1, xvii. 31, xxiii. 37, xxiv. 5 (the last two extant in a Latin translation only), *Hom. i in Luc.*, *Hom. xx in Iohann.* (viii. 46) and *xxxii* (xiii. 20)). In the last but one he calls it 'the command of Jesus' (τὴν ἐντολὴν Ἰησοῦ).

Jerome (*Ad Minervium et Alexandrum*, Martianay's edition iv. 220) calls these words 'the words of the Saviour' (Saluatoris verba); he quotes 1 Thess. v. 21 immediately before as 'that saying of the Apostle' (illud Apostoli). He also refers to them twice in his *Comm. in Ephes.* iii. (on Eph. iv. end, and v. 10), once in his *Comm. in Philemon.*, 5, and once in his *Apologia adv. Rufinum*, i. 4.

Johannes Cassianus (writing about 420 A.D.) calls them once 'the precept of the Lord' (praeceptum Domini, *Collat.* i. 20) and once 'that comparison [or, parable] in the Gospel' (illam evangelicam parabolam, *Collat.* ii. 9).

Socrates (1st half of 5th cent.) writes 'both Christ and his Apostle give us word to become proved bankers, so as to prove all things, holding fast the good' (παρεγγυῶσιν ἡμῖν δ τε Χριστὸς καὶ δ τούτου Ἀπόστολος γίνεσθαι τραπεζίται[ς?] δοκιμοί[ς?] ὔστε τὰ πάντα δοκιμάσειν, τὸ καλὸν κατέχοντας, *Hist. Ecol.* iii. 16).

The Caesarius of unknown date (but almost certainly not Caesarius of Nazianzus) who wrote the *Quaestiones* quotes the saying as 'in Gospels' (ἐν Εὐαγγελίοις—sic): see *Resp. ad Quaest.* 140.

The Apostolic Constitutions (3rd cent.), Athanasius (writing about 358), Gregory of Nazianzus (who died about 390), Ambrose (who died in 397), Palladius (who died before 431?), Paulinus of Nola (who died in 431), Procopius of Gaza (who flourished about 520), Gregory the Great (writing 584–7), Johannes Damascenus (who died after 755), Epiphanius Diaconus (writing in 787), Nikephorus (who died in 828), and Petrus Siculus (whoever he may be) refer to the saying without implying anything with regard to its source—except that Palladius calls it 'Scripture'—φησίν ἡ γραφή, 'the Scripture saith'; Procopius (the words are extant in a Latin translation only), after quoting as Paul's 1 Thess. v. 21, adds 'For the saints are proved bankers,' and Nikephorus (whose words are also extant only in a Latin translation) speaks of it as a 'divine oracle' (divinum oraculum). See *Apost. Const.* ii. 36; Athanasius, *Ep. ad Solitarios*; Nazianzenus, 'Carmine Iambico 18, p. 218' (Cotélier's reference, which I have not yet succeeded in tracing); Ambrose, *Explan. in Luc.*, *praef.*; Palladius, *De Vita Chrysostomi*, 4; Paulinus, *Epist.* 4; Procopius, *in Lev.* p. 331; Gregory, *Moralia*, xxxiii. 35 (Migne); Damascenus, *Expos. Fid. Orthod.* iv. 18; Epiphanius Diaconus, *Panegyr. ad Synod.*; Nikephorus, *Hist. x.* 36; Petrus Siculus, *Hist.* at beginning.

That licentious translator Rufinus in his version of Eusebius coolly substituted for these words 1 Thess. v. 21 in the quotation from Dionysius Alexandrinus. Did he think them a mere faulty reminiscence of Paul's words? but so devoted a student of Origen, and one for so many years the friend and neighbour of Jerome, must surely have come across them more than once before. And if so he must have made the substitution not because he knew no such words, but because he knew they were not an 'Apostolic utterance.'

That the lost work in which they occurred was the Gospel according to the Hebrews is probable (1) from our first meeting with them in an Ebionite writing, and (2) from their quotation by Origen. I do not adduce Jerome, because he may

*57. ?? Matt. xxv. If ye have not † kept the little, who shall give
between vv. 30 you the great? For I say unto you that he who
and 31. is faithful in least is faithful also in much.

§ 58. Matt. xxvii. wagging their heads and saying }
39-43. . . . wagged their heads and said } . . .
Mark xv. 29-32. ‘Let him that raised up dead men deliver himself
Luke xxiii. 35.

have taken them from Origen, whom he had studied so much. Clement of Alexandria, who quotes the Gospel according to the Hebrews as Scripture, yet joins our fragment to the verse in Thessalonians, may be thought to afford a presumption that it was not in the Gospel according to the Hebrews: but the untrustworthiness of his memory is evidenced by the very fact of his attributing it to Paul, and, this granted, we might even consider that his knowledge of the saying strengthens the probability of its having been contained in our lost Gospel.

† Rendered wrongly ‘exchangers,’ as if κολλύβιστας, by Prof. Westcott and ‘money-changers’ by Mr. Dodd: ‘exchangers’ is also the rendering of our version in Matt. xxv. 27, where the Greek word is the same.

* ‘Second Epistle of Clement,’ viii. 5—Δέγει γὰρ δὲ Κύριος ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ ‘Εἰ τὸ μικρὸν οὐκ ἔτηρθατε, τὸ μέγα τίς ὑμῖν δώσει; λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν δτὶ δ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ πιστός ἔστιν, ‘For the Lord saith in the Gospel &c.’

So Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* ii. 43 § 3 (the 2nd century Latin translation, the Greek being lost), ‘And therefor did the Lord say to those that were unthankful toward him “If ye have not been faithful in a [or, the] little, who will give you the great?”’ (et ideo Dominus dicebat ingratiss in eum existentibus ‘Si in modico fideles non fuistis, quod magnum est quis dabit vobis?’).

Cf. Luke xvi. 10-12, ‘He who is faithful in least is faithful in much, and he who is unjust in least is unjust also in much. If therefor ye have not been faithful in the unjust riches, who shall entrust to you the true? And if ye have not been faithful in another man’s, who shall give you your own?’ (Ο πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ πιστός ἔστιν . . . Εἰ οὖν ἐν τῷ ἀδίκῳ μαμωνῷ πιστὸς οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ἀληθινὸν τίς ὑμῖν πιστεύσει; Καὶ, εἰ ἐν τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ πιστὸς οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ὑμέτερον τίς δώσει ὑμῖν;)

The passage in Luke is the application of the parable of the Unjust Steward. It is the opinion of many New Testament critics that Luke wrote another copy of his work with occasional variations. It is possible that the author of the ‘Second Epistle of Clement’ took his quotation from a copy of Luke, and that Irenaeus either did the same or borrowed it from our author.

At the same time the quotation also reminds us a little of Matt. xxv. 21, 23, ‘Thou wert faithful over few things, I will set thee over many’ (Ἐπὶ δλίγα ἡς πιστός, ἐπὶ πολλῶν σε καταστήσω). That passage is in the parable of the Talents, which we know was found in a variant form in the Gospel according to the Hebrews—see Fr. 24. The passage in the ‘Second Epistle of Clement’ would serve well enough as a moral from this other version of the parable.

† The Greek verb is found 17 times in John, 3 times (i.e. in this sense) in Matthew, once in Mark, never in Luke, but 10 times in Acts (7 times of keeping in prison).

§ The passage in Matthew (to whom this is nearer than to Mark or Luke) is as follows:—And they that passed by reviled him, wagging their heads and saying ‘Thou that pullest down the Temple and in three days buildest it, save thyself, if

. . . . He called himself Son of God : let him come down and walk about, let God save him.'

*59. Matt. xxvii.

Saying 'Woe unto us ! What hath been done

after v. 54.

thou art Son of God, and come down from the cross.' In like wise also the chief priests mocking, with the scribes and elders, said 'Others he saved, himself he cannot save. He is [*so editors now read*] King of Israel ! Let him come down now from the cross, and we will believe on him. He hath trusted on God : let Him deliver him now if He desireth him—for he said that "I am Son of God."

My supposed fragment is taken from two passages in which Justin refers to the fulfilment of Ps. xxii. 7, 8, in the events at the Crucifixion. The first passage is :—'And again when He saith "*They spake with lips, they wagged head, saying 'Let him deliver himself.'*" That all of which things were done by the Jews to Christ ye can learn. For when he had been crucified they turned out their lips and wagged their heads, saying "Let him that raised up dead men deliver himself" (*ἔξεστρεφον τὰ χεῖλη καὶ ἐκίνουν τὰς κεφαλάς, λέγοντες "Οὐ νεκρός ἀνεγέλπας βυσσόθω ἁντέβω"*)'—*Apol.* i. 38. The second passage is :—'And as to what follows—*All they who beheld ye thrust out nostrils at me and spake with lips, they wagged head* : "*He hoped on the Lord : let Him deliver him, since He desireth him*"—he foretold the happening of the same things in like manner to him. For those who beheld him crucified both wagged heads each of them and turned apart their lips and with their nostrils sneering [*διερινοῦντες, sic*] among themselves said in irony these things, which are also written in the memoirs of his Apostles, "He called himself Son of God : let him come down and walk about, let God save him" (*ἔλεγον εἰρωνεύμενοι ταῦτα & καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν Ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ γέγραπται, "Τίδιν Θεοῦ ἁντέν τὴν ἔλεγε καταβὰς περιπατεῖτω, σωσάτω αὐτὸν δὲ Θεός")'—*Dial.* 101.*

Justin's looseness of quotation from the Old Testament is very conspicuous, and here we have an example of it. The Septuagint version of the Psalms, which he was quoting, has *All they that beheld me put out nostril at me, spake with lips, wagged head*: '*He hoped on the Lord, let Him deliver him, let Him save him, since He desireth him.*' In neither passage does Justin cite this correctly, in the former passage the misquotation is very bad indeed. And it is to my mind just as probable as not that the words which I have strung together as a 'fragment' are a like misquotation from the canonical Gospels.

Supposing them to be taken from some lost Gospel, I should not regard the additional words expressing the contemptuous facepulling of the bystanders as any part of the quotation. Justin has a way of supplementing the canonical narrative with details illustrating the fulfilment of prophecy. He never appeals to any authority for *these* details, and I look on them as only plausible guesses of his own, which it would not be difficult to parallel out of Renan or Farrar, and which he did not intend to palm off on the reader as statements of Scripture any more than they do.

* After a verse corresponding to Matt. xxvii. 54, Luke xxiii. 48 proceeds—'And all the people that came together to that sight, when they had beheld what had been done, smote their breasts and returned.'

The Curetonian Syriac reads 'were smiting upon their breast and saying "Woe unto us ! What is this ! Woe unto us from our sins!"'

to-day ! Woe unto us for our sins, for the desolation of Jerusalem hath drawn nigh.'

†60. Luke xxiv. 25. Wherefor do ye not perceive the reasonableness of the Scriptures ?

†61. John v. 46. I am he concerning whom Moses prophesied, saying 'A prophet will the Lord our God raise unto you from your brethren, even as me : him hear ye in all things, and whosoever heareth not that prophet shall die.'

§62. He that is near me is near the fire, and he that is far from me is far from the kingdom.

The MS. *g¹* of the Old Latin reads 'saying "Woe unto us ! What hath been done to-day for our sins, for the desolation of Jerusalem hath drawn nigh."

In the Syriac 'Doctrine of Addaeus the Apostle,' p. 10 of Wright's translation in the Ante-Nicene Library, we read 'For, behold, unless they who crucified him had known that he was the Son of God, they would not have proclaimed the desolation of their city, nor would they have divulged the affliction of their soul in crying, "Woe!"' This work can hardly be later than the 3rd cent.

It is clear that 'the Doctrine of Addaeus,' the MS. *g¹*, and the Curetonian Syriac are all indebted to some evangelic record not later than the 2nd cent. Seeing that the Curetonian and Old Latin have such affinities with our lost Gospel, and that the writer of 'the Doctrine of Addaeus' was far more likely to have drawn this tradition from native than from foreign sources, it is justifiable to guess that the passage formed part of the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Whether the Curetonian had any such addition in Matthew we cannot tell, as it is deficient after xxiii. 25.

† Clementine Homilies, iii. 50—Διὰ τί οὐ νοεῖτε τὸ εὐλογον τῶν γραφῶν;

It would seem to fit in very well in Luke xxiv. between vv. 25 and 26 : 'O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken, Wherefor do ye not perceive the reasonableness of the Scriptures ? Ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into his glory ?'

The parallel cannot be with Mark xii. 24, for that had been quoted only a few lines before.

‡ Clementine Homilies, iii. 53—Ἐτι μὴν ἔλεγεν Ἐγώ εἰμι περὶ οὐ Μωϋσῆς προεφήτευσεν εἰπάν “Προφήτην ἐγερεῖ ὁμῶν Κύριος δὲ Θεός ἡμῶν ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐμέ· αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε κατὰ πάντα, διὸ δὲ μὴ ἀκούσῃς τοὺς προφήτους ἐκείνους ἀποθανεῖται,”’ ‘Nay further he said &c.’ The quotation is from Deut. xviii. 15 and 19. These verses are also quoted in Acts iii. 22–8, but, although in each Deut. xviii. 19 is quoted *freely*, the difference from Acts is very marked.

§ Origen, *Hom. in Ierem.* iii. p. 778 (Latin translation, the Greek being lost)—‘I have read somewhere as if from the mouth of the Saviour—and I should like to know whether some one has represented the person [*or*, drawn a portrait] of the Saviour or whether he has brought to mind what is said and it be true—however the Saviour himself says “He that is near me is near the fire ; he that is far from me is far from the kingdom” (Legi alicubi quasi Salvatore

* 63. The evil one is the tempter.

† 64. Give not a pretext to the evil one.

dicente—et quaero sive quis personam figurari Salvatoris, sive in memoriam adduxerit ac verum sit hoc quod dictum est—ait autem ipse Salvator “Qui iuxta me est iuxta ignem est; qui longe a me longe est a regno”.)

Didymus (died 396 A.D.) in *Ps.* 88, 8—‘Wherefor saith the Saviour “He that is near me is near the fire, and he that is far from me is far from the kingdom” (διὸ φησὶν δὲ Σωτὴρ ‘Ο ἐγγὺς μου ἐγγὺς τοῦ πυρός, δὲ μακρὰν ἀπὸ ἐμοῦ μακρὰν ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας’).

The fact of this saying being found in Origen is in favour of its connexion with the Gospel according to the Hebrews, but the terms in which he refers to it are against this supposition unless he had forgotten where he read it. Didymus may have borrowed it from Origen.

* Clementine Homilies, iii. 55—Τοῖς δὲ οἰομένοις δτι δ Θεὸς πειράζει, ὡς αἱ γραφαὶ λέγονται ἔφη ‘Ο πονηρὸς ἐστιν δὲ πειράζων’—δ καὶ αὐτὸν πειράσας, ‘And, to those who think that God tempts, as the Scriptures say he said “The evil one is the tempter”—who tempted even him.’

The author of *Supernatural Religion* renders from the same Greek ‘The evil one is the tempter, who also tempted himself’ as the saying of Jesus. This is one more instance of his notoriously bad scholarship: *αὐτὸν* not *αὐτὸν* would be required to make his rendering possible. As the Clementine Homilies were undoubtedly written without breathings, he is welcome to make the necessary change, but I doubt whether the devil can reasonably be said to have tempted himself: the phrase ‘to tempt oneself’ does not occur in the N.T.

† Clementine Homilies, xix. 2—ἔφη . . . ‘Μή δέτε πρόφασιν τῷ πονηρῷ,’ ‘he said &c.’ Paul (Eph. iv. 27) has an exact parallel, ‘And do not give a ground to the devil.’ It is scarcely to be believed that the author of the Homilies, which are written against Paul, should have inadvertently quoted his words as those of Jesus.



BY THE SAME WRITER.

Will be published in January 1880,

A COMMENTARY

ON THE

GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW.

This Commentary, which has taken some years in preparation, is the first (if it find favour) of a series of Commentaries on the Gospels and Acts, which are meant to be more complete in matters of textual criticism, translation, and illustration than any yet published in English, and to be so free from the implication of any dogmatic or anti-dogmatic views as to be equally acceptable to readers of the most opposite religious beliefs.

Lately published, crown 8vo. cloth 3s. 6d.

THE RIGHTS OF AN ANIMAL. A NEW ESSAY IN ETHICS.

*Exclud.
man*

With Extracts from the Writings of JOHN LAWRENCE.

'Has the advantage of setting forth, without exaggeration, that man's duty to his neighbour extends to the lower animals, even to those which possess only the slightest capacity for feeling pleasure or pain. . . . If he could induce clergymen and other teachers of morality to show ignorant people how needful it is to study the wants of all the living beings they have in their charge, he would have done much for the happiness of the world.'—ACADEMY.

'Mr. Nicholson keeps his advocacy of animals' rights well within certain limits of common sense. . . . The extracts from Lawrence . . . are interesting additions to a quaint and simple essay on this branch of ethics.'—BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

'A weighty little book, to which we desire to draw particular attention. . . We urge the purchase and perusal of the book on the clergy, that they may work its material into sermons and lectures, and so spread its teaching widely throughout the country.'—CHURCH TIMES.

'As logical and sensible in prose as he is gracefully original and fancifully tender in poetry. . . . If Mr. Nicholson's own treatment of the question were not so well worthy heedful attention as it is, we should commend the book to public acceptance for the sake of these notes and extracts.'—DAILY TELEGRAPH.

'A very valuable history and statement of a question that we do not properly understand.'—EDINBURGH DAILY REVIEW.

'In support of his views he has certainly brought forward arguments which deserve consideration, and which, it is to be hoped, will not be thrown away upon those to whom his essay is especially (*sic*) addressed.'—FIELD.

'In fact, both the Essay and the Appendix are such as to claim, as a kind of right, that they should be studied carefully. They together form one of the ablest additions to works on the claims of animals to be kindly treated we have seen since the late Sir Arthur Helps's work.'—**LAND AND WATER.**

'Has reasoned out this subject with some carefulness, and, we think, success.'

LITERARY WORLD.

'Characterised by great thoughtfulness, often by striking originality, and by a thorough independence of mind. . . . The great point in regard to such subjects as the one before us is to get people seriously to think of them. This Mr. Nicholson will do wherever his book may be read. He has, therefore, done a service both to humanity, and to the living nature that is not humanity. The extracts in the Appendix are admirable.'—**NONCONFORMIST.**

'Much ability and logical force. . . . There is a tone of healthy common sense and an absence of false sentiment about the essay, which make it a really valuable contribution to the literature of the subject.'—**SCOTSMAN.**

'Original in character, written in an original manner, and with an original style of its own. . . . Very racy, very piquant, and very telling is the line of argument taken; it is by far the best book for "prevention of cruelty to animals" we know; of course of a much higher order than the Society's well-meant tracts, placing the subject on a broader, firmer, wider, basis, illustrating it in a far more effective and real way, and very discreetly limiting it by other rights.'—**UNIVERSITY MAGAZINE.**

Crown 8vo. cloth, 4s. 6d.

THE CHRIST-CHILD, AND OTHER POEMS.

'Very bad verse—artificial and affected in language, crude and obscure in idea. . . . Persons thus christened may be predestined to make themselves ridiculous. . . . His verses are rubbish, pure and simple, from beginning to end.'—**WORLD.**

'No piece which does not possess some grace or tenderness, or touch of fancy or of humour. . . . Proves the presence amongst us of a man of true poetical feeling and culture.'—**ACADEMY.**

'Among the writers of verse he would have an unusual prospect of distinction. . . . Whatever style Mr. Nicholson chooses to employ he uses with grace and skill.'

SPECTATOR.

'Far more originality is shown in Mr. Nicholson's "The Christ-Child" . . . His preface is a model of good sense. We think he has fairly estimated his own powers. He seems to be quite aware, what the majority of poets are not aware of, that, to take any rank as a poet in these days, life must be dedicated to the Muses.'

WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

C. KEGAN PAUL & CO., 1 Paternoster Square, London

A LIST OF
C. KEGAN PAUL & CO.'S
PUBLICATIONS.

THE
NINETEENTH CENTURY.
A Monthly Review.
EDITED BY JAMES KNOWLES.

Price 2*s.* 6*d.*

VOLS. I. & II. PRICE 1*s.* EACH, VOL. III. 1*7s.*, CONTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS
BY THE FOLLOWING WRITERS:—

RABBI HERMANN ADLER.	REV. MALCOLM MACCOLL.
THE DUKE OF ARGYLL.	REV. A. H. MACKONOCHEIE.
ARTHUR ARNOLD.	CARDINAL MANNING.
MATTHEW ARNOLD.	REV. DR. MARTINEAU.
REV. DR. GEORGE PERCY BADGER, D.C.L.	HIS HIGHNESS MIDHAT PASHA.
REV. CANON BARRY.	PROFESSOR HENRY MORLEY.
DR. H. CHARLTON BASTIAN.	RIGHT HON. LYON PLAYFAIR, M.P.
SIR T. BAZLEY, M.P.	MR. GEORGE POTTER.
MR. EDGAR BOWRING.	W. R. S. RALSTON,
MR. THOMAS BRASSEY, M.P.	VISCOUNT STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE.
REV. J. BALDWIN BROWN.	PROFESSOR CROOM ROBERTSON.
PROFESSOR GEORGE VON BUNSEN.	REV. J. GUINNESS ROGERS.
DR. W. B. CARPENTER.	PROFESSOR RUSKIN.
PROFESSOR CLIFFORD.	THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S.
PROFESSOR COLVIN.	LORD SELBORNE.
REV. R. W. DALE.	PROFESSOR GOLDWIN SMITH.
Mr. EDWARD DICEY.	JAMES SPEDDING.
M. E. GRANT DUFF, M.P.	RIGHT HON. JAMES STANSFIELD, M.P.
ARCHIBALD FORBES.	SIR JAMES FITZJAMES STEPHEN.
JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE.	ALFRED TENNYSON.
THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.	PROFESSOR TYNDALL.
THE BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.	SIR JULIUS VOGEL.
Mr. W. R. GREG.	SIR THOMAS WATSON, M.D.
MR. FREDERIC HARRISON.	DR. WARD.
MR. GEORGE J. HOLYOAKE.	MR. FREDERICK WEDMORE.
Mr. R. H. HUTTON.	THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF WEST- MINSTER.
PROFESSOR HUXLEY.	MAJOR-GEN. SIR GARNET WOLSELEY.
HENRY IRVING.	THE RIGHT HON. CHAS. WORDSWORTH.
SIR JOHN LUBBOCK.	&c. &c.

• Paternoster Square,
London.

A LIST OF C. KEGAN PAUL & CO.'S PUBLICATIONS.

ABDULLA (*Hakayit*)—AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A MALAY MUNSHI. Translated by J. T. THOMSON, F.R.G.S. With Photo-lithograph Page of Abdulla's MS. Post 8vo. price 12s.

ADAMS (A. L.) *M.A., M.B., F.R.S., F.G.S.*—FIELD AND FOREST RAMBLES OF A NATURALIST IN NEW BRUNSWICK. With Notes and Observations on the Natural History of Eastern Canada. Illustrated. 8vo. price 14s.

ADAMS (F. O.) *F.R.G.S.*—THE HISTORY OF JAPAN. From the Earliest Period to the Present Time. New Edition, revised. 2 volumes. With Maps and Plans. Demy 8vo. price 21s. each.

A. K. H. B.—A SCOTCH COMMUNION SUNDAY, to which are added Certain Discourses from a University City. By the Author of 'The Recreations of a Country Parson.' Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
FROM A QUIET PLACE. A New Volume of Sermons. Crown 8vo. cloth.

ALBERT (*Mary*).—HOLLAND AND HER HEROES TO THE YEAR 1585. An Adaptation from 'Motley's Rise of the Dutch Republic.' Small crown 8vo. price 4s. 6d.

ALLEN (*Rev. R.*) *M.A.*—ABRAHAM ; HIS LIFE, TIMES, AND TRAVELS, 3,800 years ago. With Map. Second Edition. Post 8vo. price 6s.

ALLEN (*Grant*) *B.A.*—PHYSIOLOGICAL ÆSTHETICS. Large post 8vo. 9s.

ANDERSON (*Rev. C.*) *M.A.*—NEW READINGS OF OLD PARABLES. Demy 8vo. price 4s. 6d.

CHURCH THOUGHT AND CHURCH WORK. Edited by. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

THE CURATE OF SHYRE. Second Edition. 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

ANDERSON (*R. C.*) *C.E.*—TABLES FOR FACILITATING THE CALCULATION OF EVERY DETAIL IN CONNECTION WITH EARTHEN AND MASONRY DAMS. Royal 8vo. price £2. 2s.

ARCHER (*Thomas*)—ABOUT MY FATHER'S BUSINESS. Work amidst the Sick, the Sad, and the Sorrowing. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

ARNOLD (*Arthur*)—SOCIAL POLITICS. Demy 8vo. cloth.

A List of

BAGEHOT (Walter)—THE ENGLISH CONSTITUTION. A New Edition, Revised and Corrected, with an Introductory Dissertation on Recent Changes and Events. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

LOMBARD STREET. A Description of the Money Market. Seventh Edition. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

SOME ARTICLES ON THE DEPRECIATION OF SILVER, AND TOPICS CONNECTED WITH IT. Demy 8vo. price 5s.

BAGOT (Alan)—ACCIDENTS IN MINES : Their Causes and Prevention. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

BAKER (Sir Sherston, Bart.)—HALLECK'S INTERNATIONAL LAW ; or, Rules Regulating the Intercourse of States in Peace and War. A New Edition, revised, with Notes and Cases. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. price 38s.

BALDWIN (Capt. J. H.) F.Z.S. Bengal Staff Corps.—THE LARGE AND SMALL GAME OF BENGAL AND THE NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES OF INDIA. 4to. With numerous Illustrations. Second Edition. Price 21s.

BARNES (William)—AN OUTLINE OF ENGLISH SPEECHCRAFT. Crown 8vo. price 4s.

BARTLEY (G. C. T.)—DOMESTIC ECONOMY : Thrift in Every-Day Life. Taught in Dialogues suitable for children of all ages. Small Cr. 8vo. price 2s.

BAUR (Ferdinand) Dr. Ph., Professor in Maulbronn.—A PHILOLOGICAL INTRODUCTION TO GREEK AND LATIN FOR STUDENTS. Translated and adapted from the German. By C. KEGAN PAUL, M.A. Oxon., and the Rev. E. D. STONE, M.A., late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and Assistant Master at Eton. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

BAYNES (Rev. Canon R. H.)—AT THE COMMUNION TIME. A Manual for Holy Communion. With a preface by the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe. Cloth, price 1s. 6d.

BECKER (Bernard H.)—THE SCIENTIFIC SOCIETIES OF LONDON. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

BELLINGHAM (Henry) Barrister-at-Law—SOCIAL ASPECTS OF CATHOLICISM AND PROTESTANTISM IN THEIR CIVIL BEARING UPON NATIONS. Translated and adapted from the French of M. le Baron de Haulleville. With a preface by His Eminence Cardinal Manning. Crown 8vo price 6s.

BENNIE (Rev. J. N.) M.A.—THE ETERNAL LIFE. Sermons preached during the last twelve years. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

BERNARD (Bayle)—SAMUEL LOVER, HIS LIFE AND UNPUBLISHED WORKS. In 2 vols. With a Steel Portrait. Post 8vo. price 21s.

BISCOE (A. C.)—THE EARLS OF MIDDLETON, Lords of Clermont and of Fettercairn, and the Middleton Family. Crown 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

BISSET (A.)—HISTORY OF THE STRUGGLE FOR PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT IN ENGLAND. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. price 24s.

BLANC (H.) M.D.—CHOLERA : How to AVOID AND TREAT IT. Popular and Practical Notes. Crown 8vo. price 4s. 6d.

BONWICK (J.) F.R.G.S.—PYRAMID FACTS AND FANCIES. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

EGYPTIAN BELIEF AND MODERN THOUGHT. Large Post 8vo. cloth, price 10s. 6d.

BOWEN (H. C.) M.A., Head Master of the Grocers' Company's Middle Class School at Hackney.

STUDIES IN ENGLISH, for the use of Modern Schools. Small crown 8vo. price 1s. 6d.

BOWRING (L.) C.S.I.—EASTERN EXPERIENCES. Illustrated with Maps and Diagrams. Demy 8vo. price 16s.

BOWRING (Sir John).—AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL RECOLLECTIONS OF SIR JOHN BOWRING. With Memoir by LEWIN B. BOWRING. Demy 8vo. price 14s.

BRADLEY (F. H.)—ETHICAL STUDIES. Critical Essays in Moral Philosophy. Large post 8vo. price 9s.

MR. SIDGWICK'S HEDONISM : an Examination of the Main Argument of 'The Methods of Ethics.' Demy 8vo. sewed, price 2s. 6d.

BROOKE (Rev. S. A.) M.A., Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty the Queen, and Minister of Bedford Chapel, Bloomsbury.

LIFE AND LETTERS OF THE LATE REV. F. W. ROBERTSON, M.A., Edited by.

I. Uniform with the Sermons. 2 vols. With Steel Portrait. Price 7s. 6d.

II. Library Edition. 8vo. With Two Steel Portraits. Price 12s.

III. A Popular Edition. In 1 vol. 8vo. price 6s.

THE FIGHT OF FAITH. Sermons preached on various occasions. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

THEOLOGY IN THE ENGLISH POETS.—Cowper, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Burns. Third Edition. Post 8vo. price 9s.

CHRIST IN MODERN LIFE. Eleventh Edition. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

SERMONS. First Series. Ninth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

SERMONS. Second Series. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 7s.

FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE : The Life and Work of. A Memorial Sermon. Crown 8vo. sewed, price 1s.

BROOKE (W. G.) M.A.—THE PUBLIC WORSHIP REGULATION ACT. With a Classified Statement of its Provisions, Notes, and Index. Third Edition, revised and corrected. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

SIX PRIVY COUNCIL JUDGMENTS—1850-72. Annotated by. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 9s.

BROUN (J. A.)—MAGNETIC OBSERVATIONS AT TREVANDRUM AND AUGUSTIA MALLEY. Vol. I. 4to. price 63s.

The Report from above, separately sewed, price 21s.

BROWN (Rev. J. Baldwin) B.A.—THE HIGHER LIFE. Its Reality Experience, and Destiny. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

DOCTRINE OF ANNIHILATION IN THE LIGHT OF THE GOSPEL OF LOVE. Five Discourses. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

BROWN (J. Croumbe) LL.D.—REBOISEMENT IN FRANCE ; or, Records of the Replanting of the Alps, the Cevennes, and the Pyrenees with Trees, Herbage, and Bush. Demy 8vo. price 12s. 6d.

THE HYDROLOGY OF SOUTHERN AFRICA.. Demy 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

BROWNE (Rev. M. E.)—UNTIL THE DAY DAWN. Four Adven
Lectures. Crown 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

**BURCKHARDT (Jacob)—THE CIVILIZATION OF THE PERIOD OF THE
RENAISSANCE IN ITALY.** Authorised translation, by S. G. C. Middlemore.
2 vols. Demy 8vo. price 24s.

BURTON (Mrs. Richard)—THE INNER LIFE OF SYRIA, PALESTINE, AND
THE HOLY LAND. With Maps, Photographs, and Coloured Plates. 2 vols.
Second Edition. Demy 8vo. price 24s.

**BURTON (Capt. Richard F.)—THE GOLD MINES OF MIDIAN AND THE
RUINED MIDIANITE CITIES.** A Fortnight's Tour in North Western Arabia.
With numerous illustrations. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. price 18s.

CARLISLE (A. D.) B.A.—ROUND THE WORLD IN 1870. A Volume of
Travels, with Maps. New and Cheaper Edition. Demy 8vo. price 6s.

CARNE (Miss E. T.)—THE REALM OF TRUTH. Crown 8vo. price 5s. 6d.

**CARPENTER (W. B.) LL.D., M.D., F.R.S., &c.—THE PRINCIPLES
OF MENTAL PHYSIOLOGY.** With their Applications to the Training and
Discipline of the Mind, and the Study of its Morbid Conditions. Illustrated.
Fourth Edition. 8vo. price 12s.

**CHILDREN'S TOYS, and some Elementary Lessons in General Knowledge
which they Teach.** With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

CHRISTOPHERSON (The Late Rev. Henry) M.A.

SERMONS. With an Introduction by John Rae, LL.D., F.S.A.
Second Series. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

CLODD (Edward) F.R.A.S.—THE CHILDHOOD OF THE WORLD: a
Simple Account of Man in Early Times. Third Edition. Crown 8vo.
price 3s.
A Special Edition for Schools. Price 1s.

THE CHILDHOOD OF RELIGIONS. Including a Simple Account of the
Birth and Growth of Myths and Legends. Third Thousand. Crown 8vo.
price 5s.
A Special Edition for Schools. Price 1s. 6d.

COLERIDGE (Sara)—PHANTASMION. A Fairy Tale. With an Intro-
ductory Preface by the Right Hon. Lord Coleridge, of Ottery St. Mary. A
New Edition. Illustrated. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

MEMOIR AND LETTERS OF SARA COLERIDGE. Edited by her Daughter.
With Index. 2 vols. With Two Portraits. Third Edition, Revised and
Corrected. Crown 8vo. price 24s.
Cheap Edition. With one Portrait. Price 7s. 6d.

COLLINS (Rev. R.) M.A.—MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE IN THE EAST.
With special reference to the Syrian Christians of Malabar, and the Results
of Modern Missions. With Four Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

COOKE (Prof. J. P.) of the Harvard University.—SCIENTIFIC CULTURE.
Crown 8vo. price 1s.

COOPER (T. T.) F.R.G.S.—THE MISHMEE HILLS: an Account of a
Journey made in an Attempt to Penetrate Thibet from Assam, to open New
Routes for Commerce. Second Edition. With Four Illustrations and Map.
Post 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

CORY (Lieut.-Col. Arthur)—THE EASTERN MENACE ; OR, SHADOWS OF COMING EVENTS. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

COX (Rev. Sir. George W.) M.A., Bart.—A HISTORY OF GREECE FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO THE END OF THE PERSIAN WAR. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. price 36s.

THE MYTHOLOGY OF THE ARYAN NATIONS. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. price 28s.

A GENERAL HISTORY OF GREECE FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO THE DEATH OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT, with a sketch of the subsequent History to the present time. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

TALES OF ANCIENT GREECE. Third Edition. Small crown 8vo. price 6s.

SCHOOL HISTORY OF GREECE. With Maps. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

THE GREAT PERSIAN WAR FROM THE HISTORY OF HERODOTUS. New Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

A MANUAL OF MYTHOLOGY IN THE FORM OF QUESTION AND ANSWER. Third Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s.

COX (Rev. Samuel)—SALVATOR MUNDI ; OR, IS CHRIST THE SAVIOUR OF ALL MEN? Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

CROMPTON (Henry)—INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION. Fcap. 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

CURWEN (Henry)—SORROW AND SONG: STUDIES OF LITERARY STRUGGLE. Henry Mürgur—Novalis—Alexander Petöfi—Honoré de Balzac—Edgar Allan Poe—André Chénier. 2 vols. crown 8vo. price 15s.

DANCE (Rev. C. D.)—RECOLLECTIONS OF FOUR YEARS IN VENEZUELA. With Three Illustrations and a Map. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

DAVIDSON (Rev. Samuel) D.D., LL.D.—THE NEW TESTAMENT, TRANSLATED FROM THE LATEST GREEK TEXT OF TISCHENDORF. A New and thoroughly revised Edition. Post 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

CANON OF THE BIBLE: ITS FORMATION, HISTORY, AND FLUCTUATIONS. Second Edition. Small crown 8vo. price 5s.

DAVIES (G. Christopher)—MOUNTAIN, MEADOW, AND MERE: A SERIES OF OUTDOOR SKETCHES OF SPORT, SCENERY, ADVENTURES, AND NATURAL HISTORY. WITH SIXTEEN ILLUSTRATIONS BY BOSWORTH W. HARcourt. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

DAVIES (Rev. J. L.) M.A.—THEOLOGY AND MORALITY. ESSAYS ON QUESTIONS OF BELIEF AND PRACTICE. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

DAWSON (Geo.) M.A.—PRAYERS, WITH A DISCOURSE ON PRAYER. Edited by his Wife. Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.

SERMONS ON DISPUTED POINTS AND SPECIAL OCCASIONS. Edited by his Wife. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

SERMONS ON DAILY LIFE AND DUTY. Edited by his Wife. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

DE LESSEPS (Ferdinand)—THE SUEZ CANAL: LETTERS DESCRIPTIVE OF ITS RISE AND PROGRESS IN 1854-1856. Translated by N. R. D'ANVERS. Demy 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

DE REDCLIFFE (Viscount Stratford) P.C., K.G., G.C.B.—WHY AM I A CHRISTIAN? Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 3*s.*

DESPREZ (Philip S.) B.D.—DANIEL AND JOHN. Demy 8vo. cloth.

DE TOCQUEVILLE (A.)—CORRESPONDENCE AND CONVERSATIONS OF, WITH NASSAU WILLIAM SENIOR, from 1834 to 1859. Edited by M. C. M. SIMPSON. 2 vols. post 8vo. price 2*ls.*

DOWDEN (Edward) LL.D.—SHAKSPERE: a Critical Study of his Mind and Art. Third Edition. Post 8vo. price 1*2s.*

STUDIES IN LITERATURE, 1789–1877. Large Post 8vo. price 1*2s.*

DREW (Rev. G. S.) M.A.—SCRIPTURE LANDS IN CONNECTION WITH THEIR HISTORY. Second Edition. 8vo. price 1*0s. 6d.*

NAZARETH: ITS LIFE AND LESSONS. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5*s.*

THE DIVINE KINGDOM ON EARTH AS IT IS IN HEAVEN. 8vo. price 1*0s. 6d.*

THE SON OF MAN: His Life and Ministry. Crown 8vo. price 7*s. 6d.*

DREWRY (G. O.) M.D.—THE COMMON-SENSE MANAGEMENT OF THE STOMACH. Fourth Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 2*s. 6d.*

DREWRY (G. O.) M.D., and BARTLETT (H. C.) Ph.D., F.C.S.—CUP AND PLATTER: or, Notes on Food and its Effects. Small 8vo. price 2*s. 6d.*

EDEN (Frederick)—THE NILE WITHOUT A DRAGOMAN. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 7*s. 6d.*

ELSDALE (Henry)—STUDIES IN TENNYSON'S IDYLLS. Crown 8vo. price 5*s.*

ESSAYS ON THE ENDOWMENT OF RESEARCH. By Various Writers.

List of Contributors.—Mark Pattison, B.D.—James S. Cotton, B.A.—Charles E. Appleton, D.C.L.—Archibald H. Sayce, M.A.—Henry Clifton Sorby, F.R.S.—Thomas K. Cheyne, M.A.—W. T. Thiselton Dyer, M.A.—Henry Nettleship, M.A. Square crown 8vo. price 1*0s. 6d.*

EVANS (Mark)—THE STORY OF OUR FATHER'S LOVE, told to Children. being a New and Cheaper Edition. With Four Illustrations. Fcp. 8vo. price 1*s. 6d.*

A BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER AND WORSHIP FOR HOUSEHOLD USE, compiled exclusively from the Holy Scriptures. Fcp. 8vo. price 2*s. 6d.*

THE GOSPEL OF HOME LIFE. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 4*s. 6d.*

EX-CIVILIAN.—LIFE IN THE MOFUSSIL: or Civilian Life in Lower Bengal. 2 vols. Large post 8vo. price 1*4s.*

FAVRE (Mons. J.)—THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NATIONAL DEFENCE. From the 30th June to the 31st October, 1870. Translated by H. CLARK. Demy 8vo. price 1*0s. 6d.*

FINN (*The late James*) **M.R.A.S.**—**STIRRING TIMES**; or, Records from Jerusalem Consular Chronicles of 1853 to 1856. Edited and Compiled by his Widow; with a Preface by the Viscountess STRANGFORD. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. price 30s.

FLEMING (*James*) **D.D.**—**EARLY CHRISTIAN WITNESSES**; or, Testimonies of the First Centuries to the Truth of Christianity. Small Crown 8vo. cloth.

FOLKESTONE RITUAL CASE: the Arguments, Proceedings, Judgment, and Report. Demy 8vo. price 25s.

FOOTMAN (*Rev. H.*) **M.A.**—**FROM HOME AND BACK**; or, Some Aspects of Sin as seen in the Light of the Parable of the Prodigal. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

FOWLE (*Rev. Edmund*)—**LATIN PRIMER RULES MADE EASY**. Crown 8vo. price 3s.

FOWLE (*Rev. T. W.*) **M.A.**—**THE RECONCILIATION OF RELIGION AND SCIENCE**. Being Essays on Immortality, Inspiration, Miracles, and the Being of Christ. Demy 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

FOX-BOURNE (*H. R.*)—**THE LIFE OF JOHN LOCKE**, 1632-1704. 2 vols. demy 8vo. price 28s.

FRASER (*Donald*)—**EXCHANGE TABLES OF STERLING AND INDIAN RUPEE CURRENCY**, upon a new and extended system, embracing Values from One Farthing to One Hundred Thousand Pounds, and at rates progressing, in Sixteenths of a Penny, from 1s. 9d. to 2s. 3d. per Rupee. Royal 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

FRISWELL (*J. Hain*)—**THE BETTER SELF**. Essays for Home Life. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

FYTCHE (*Lieut.-Gen. Albert*) **C.S.I. late Chief Commissioner of British Burma**. **BURMA PAST AND PRESENT**, with Personal Reminiscences of the Country. With Steel Portraits, Chromolithographs, Engravings on Wood, and Map. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. cloth, price 30s.

GAMBIER (*Capt. J. W.*) **R.N.**—**SERVIA**. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

GARDNER (*J.*) **M.D.**—**LONGEVITY: THE MEANS OF PROLONGING LIFE AFTER MIDDLE AGE**. Fourth Edition, revised and enlarged. Small crown 8vo. price 4s

GILBERT (*Mrs.*)—**AUTOBIOGRAPHY AND OTHER MEMORIALS**. Edited by Josiah Gilbert. Third and Cheaper Edition. With Steel Portrait and several Wood Engravings. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

GILL (*Rev. W. W.*) **B.A.**—**MYTHS AND SONGS FROM THE SOUTH PACIFIC**. With a Preface by F. Max Müller, M.A., Professor of Comparative Philology at Oxford. Post 8vo. price 9s.

GODKIN (*James*)—**THE RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF IRELAND**: Primitive, Papal, and Protestant. Including the Evangelical Missions, Catholic Agitations, and Church Progress of the last half Century. 8vo. price 12s.

GODWIN (*William*)—**WILLIAM GODWIN: HIS FRIENDS AND CONTEMPORARIES**. With Portraits and Facsimiles of the Handwriting of Godwin and his Wife. By C. KEGAN PAUL. 2 vols. Large post 8vo. price 28s.

THE GENIUS OF CHRISTIANITY UNVEILED. Being Essays never before published. Edited, with a Preface, by C. Kegan Paul. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

GOODENOUGH (*Commodore J. G.*) *R.N., C.B., C.M.G.*—**MEMOIR OF** with Extracts from his Letters and Journals. Edited by his Widow. With Steel Engraved Portrait. Square 8vo. cloth, 5s.

* * Also a Library Edition with Maps, Woodcuts, and Steel Engraved Portrait. Square post 8vo. price 14s.

GOODMAN (W.) *CUBA, THE PEARL OF THE ANTILLES.* Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

GOULD (Rev. S. Baring) M.A.—*THE VICAR OF MORWENSTOW: a Memoir of the Rev. R. S. Hawker.* With Portrait. Third Edition, revised. Square post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

GRANVILLE (A. B.) M.D., F.R.S., &c.—*AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A. B. GRANVILLE, F.R.S., &c.* Edited, with a Brief Account of the Concluding Years of his Life, by his youngest Daughter, Paulina B. Granville. 2 vols. With a Portrait. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. price 32s.

GREY (John) of Dilston.—*MEMOIRS.* By JOSEPHINE E. BUTLER. New and Revised Edition. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

GRIFFITH (Rev. T.) A.M.—*STUDIES OF THE DIVINE MASTER.* Demy 8vo. price 12s.

GRIFFITHS (Capt. Arthur)—*MEMORIALS OF MILLBANK, AND CHAPTERS IN PRISON HISTORY.* With Illustrations by R. Goff and the Author. 2 vols. post 8vo. price 21s.

GRIMLEY (Rev. H. N.) M.A., Professor of Mathematics in the University College of Wales, and sometime Chaplain of Tremadoc Church.

TREMADOC SERMONS, CHIEFLY ON THE SPIRITUAL BODY, THE UNSEEN WORLD, AND THE DIVINE HUMANITY. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

GRÜNER (M. L.)—*STUDIES OF BLAST FURNACE PHENOMENA.* Translated by L. D. B. GORDON, F.R.S.E., F.G.S. Demy 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

GURNEY (Rev. Archer)—*WORDS OF FAITH AND CHEER. A Mission of Instruction and Suggestion.* Crown 8vo. price 6s.

HAECKEL (Prof. Ernst)—*THE HISTORY OF CREATION.* Translation revised by Professor E. RAY LANKESTER, M.A., F.R.S. With Coloured Plates and Genealogical Trees of the various groups of both plants and animals. 2 vols. Second Edition. Post 8vo. cloth, price 32s.

THE HISTORY OF THE EVOLUTION OF MAN. With numerous Illustrations. 2 vols. Post 8vo.

HAKE (A. Egmont)—*PARIS ORIGINALS,* with Twenty Etchings, by LÉON RICHETON. Large post 8vo. price 14s.

HALLECK'S INTERNATIONAL LAW; or, Rules Regulating the Inter-course of States in Peace and War. A New Edition, revised, with Notes and Cases, by Sir SHERSTON BAKER, Bart. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. price 38s.

HARCOURT (Capt. A. F. P.)—*THE SHAKESPEARE ARGOSY.* Containing much of the wealth of Shakespeare's Wisdom and Wit, alphabetically arranged and classified. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

HAWEIS (Rev. H. R.) M.A.—CURRENT COIN. Materialism—The Devil—Crime—Drunkenness—Pauperism—Emotion—Recreation—The Sabbath. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

SPEECH IN SEASON. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 9s.

THOUGHTS FOR THE TIMES. Eleventh Edition. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

UNSECTARIAN FAMILY PRAYERS for Morning and Evening for a Week, with short selected passages from the Bible. Second Edition. Square crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

ARROWS IN THE AIR. Conferences and Pleas. Crown 8vo. cloth.

HAYMAN (H.) D.D., late Head Master of Rugby School.—RUGBY SCHOOL SERMONS. With an Introductory Essay on the Indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

HELLWALD (Baron F. von)—THE RUSSIANS IN CENTRAL ASIA. A Critical Examination, down to the Present Time, of the Geography and History of Central Asia. Translated by Lieut.-Col. Theodore Wirgman, LL.B. With Map. Large post 8vo. price 12s.

HINTON (J.)—THE PLACE OF THE PHYSICIAN. To which is added ESSAYS ON THE LAW OF HUMAN LIFE, AND ON THE RELATIONS BETWEEN ORGANIC AND INORGANIC WORLDS. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

PHYSIOLOGY FOR PRACTICAL USE. By Various Writers. With 50 Illustrations. 2 vols. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 12s. 6d.

AN ATLAS OF DISEASES OF THE MEMBRANA TYMPANI. With Descriptive Text. Post 8vo. price £6. 6s.

THE QUESTIONS OF AURAL SURGERY. With Illustrations. 2 vols. Post 8vo. price £6. 6s.

LIFE AND LETTERS. Edited by ELLICE HOPKINS, with an Introduction by Sir W. W. GULL, Bart., and Portrait engraved on Steel by C. H. JEENS. Crown 8vo. price 8s. 6d.

CHAPTERS ON THE ART OF THINKING, and other Essays. Crown 8vo.

H. J. C.—THE ART OF FURNISHING. A Popular Treatise on the Principles of Furnishing, based on the Laws of Common Sense, Requirement, and Picturesque Effect. Small crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

HOLROYD (Major W. R. M.)—TAS-HIL UL KALAM ; or, Hindustani made Easy. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

HOOPER (Mary)—LITTLE DINNERS: HOW TO SERVE THEM WITH ELEGANCE AND ECONOMY. Thirteenth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

COOKERY FOR INVALIDS, PERSONS OF DELICATE DIGESTION, AND CHILDREN. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

EVERY-DAY MEALS. Being Economical and Wholesome Recipes for Breakfast, Luncheon, and Supper. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 5s.

HOPKINS (Ellice)—LIFE AND LETTERS OF JAMES HINTON, with an Introduction by Sir W. W. GULL, Bart., and Portrait engraved on Steel by C. H. JEENS. Crown 8vo. price 8s. 6d.

HOPKINS (M.)—THE PORT OF REFUGE ; or, Counsel and Aid to Shipmasters in Difficulty, Doubt, or Distress. Second and Revised Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

HORNE (William) M.A.—REASON AND REVELATION: an Examination into the Nature and Contents of Scripture Revelation, as compared with other Forms of Truth. Demy 8vo. price 12s.

HORNER (The Misses)—WALKS IN FLORENCE. A New and thoroughly Revised Edition. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. Cloth limp. With Illustrations.
 VOL. I.—Churches, Streets, and Palaces. Price 10s. 6d.
 VOL. II.—Public Galleries and Museums. Price 5s.

HULL (Edmund C. P.)—THE EUROPEAN IN INDIA. With a Medical Guide for Anglo-Indians. By R. S. MAIR, M.D., F.R.C.S.E. Third Edition, Revised and Corrected. Post 8vo. price 6s.

HUTTON (James)—MISSIONARY LIFE IN THE SOUTHERN SEAS. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

JACKSON (T. G.)—MODERN GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

JACOB (Maj.-Gen. Sir G. Le Grand) K.C.S.I., C.B.—WESTERN INDIA BEFORE AND DURING THE MUTINIES. Pictures drawn from Life. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

JENKINS (E.) and RAYMOND (J.) Esqs.—A LEGAL HANDBOOK FOR ARCHITECTS, BUILDERS, AND BUILDING OWNERS. Second Edition, Revised. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

JENKINS (Rev. R. C.) M.A.—THE PRIVILEGE OF PETER and the Claims of the Roman Church confronted with the Scriptures, the Councils, and the Testimony of the Popes themselves. Fcap. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

JENNINGS (Mrs. Vaughan)—RAHEL: HER LIFE AND LETTERS. With a Portrait from the Painting by Daffinger. Square post 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

JONES (Lucy)—PUDDINGS AND SWEETS; being Three Hundred and Sixty-five Receipts approved by experience. Crown 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

KAUFMANN (Rev. M.) B.A.—SOCIALISM: Its Nature, its Dangers, and its Remedies considered. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

KERNER (Dr. A.) Professor of Botany in the University of Innsbruck.—FLOWERS AND THEIR UNBIDDEN GUESTS. Translation edited by W. OGLE, M.A., M.B. With Illustrations. Square 8vo. cloth.

KIDD (Joseph) M.D.—THE LAWS OF THERAPEUTICS; or, the Science and Art of Medicine. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

KINAHAN (G. Henry) M.R.I.A., of H.M.'s Geological Survey.—THE GEOLOGY OF IRELAND, with numerous Illustrations and a Geological Map of Ireland. Square 8vo. cloth.

KING (Alice)—A CLUSTER OF LIVES. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

KINGSLEY (Charles) M.A.—LETTERS AND MEMORIES OF HIS LIFE Edited by his WIFE. With Two Steel Engraved Portraits, and Illustrations on Wood, and a Facsimile of his Handwriting. Thirteenth Edition. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. price 36s.

ALL SAINTS' DAY, and other Sermons. Edited by the Rev. W. HARRISON. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

TRUE WORDS FOR BRAVE MEN. A Book for Soldiers' and Sailor' Libraries. Crown 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

LACORDAIRE (Rev. Père)—LIFE : Conferences delivered at Toulouse.
A New and Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

LAMBERT (Cowley) F.R.G.S.—A TRIP TO CASHMERE AND LADAK.
With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

LAURIE (J. S.)—EDUCATIONAL COURSE OF SECULAR SCHOOL BOOKS
FOR INDIA :—

THE FIRST HINDUSTANI READER. Stiff linen wrapper, price 6d.

THE SECOND HINDUSTANI READER. Stiff linen wrapper, price 6d.

THE ORIENTAL (ENGLISH) READER. Book I., price 6d. ; II., price
7½d. ; III., price 9d. ; IV., price 1s.

GEOGRAPHY OF INDIA ; with Maps and Historical Appendix, tracing
the Growth of the British Empire in Hindustan. Fcap. 8vo. price 1s. 6d.

L. D. S.—LETTERS FROM CHINA AND JAPAN. With Illustrated Title-page.
Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

LEE (Rev. F. G.) D.C.L.—THE OTHER WORLD; or, Glimpses of the
Supernatural. 2 vols. A New Edition. Crown 8vo. price 15s.

LENOIR (J.)—FAYOUM ; or, Artists in Egypt. A Tour with M. Gérôme
and others. With 13 Illustrations. A New and Cheaper Edition. Crown
8vo. price 3s. 6d.

LIFE IN THE MOFUSSIL ; or, Civilian Life in Lower Bengal. By an Ex-
Civilian. Large post 8vo. price 14s.

LINDSAY (W. Lauder) M.D., F.R.S.E., &c.—MIND IN THE LOWER
ANIMALS IN HEALTH AND DISEASE. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. cloth.
Vol. I.—Mind in Health. Vol. II.—Mind in Disease.

LORIMER (Peter) D.D.—JOHN KNOX AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.
His Work in her Pulpit, and his Influence upon her Liturgy, Articles, and
Parties. Demy 8vo. price 12s.

JOHN WICLIF AND HIS ENGLISH PRECURSORS. By GERHARD VICTOR
LECHLER. Translated from the German, with additional Notes. 2 vols.
Demy 8vo. price 21s.

LOTHIAN (Roxburgh)—DANTE AND BEATRICE FROM 1282 TO 1290.
A Romance. 2 vols. Post 8vo. price 24s.

LOVER (Samuel) R.H.A.—THE LIFE OF SAMUEL LOVER, R.H.A. ;
Artistic, Literary, and Musical. With Selections from his Unpublished Papers
and Correspondence. By BAYLE BERNARD. 2 vols. With a Portrait.
Post 8vo. price 21s.

LYONS (R. T.) Surg.-Maj. Bengal Army.—A TREATISE ON RELAPSING
FEVER. Post 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

MACAULAY (J.) M.D. Edin.—THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND :
Tours of Observation in 1872 and 1875. With Remarks on Irish Public
Questions. Being a Second Edition of 'Ireland in 1872,' with a New and
Supplementary Preface. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

MACLACHLAN (A. N. C.) M.A.—WILLIAM AUGUSTUS, DUKE OF
CUMBERLAND : being a Sketch of his Military Life and Character, chiefly as
exhibited in the General Orders of His Royal Highness, 1745-1747. With
Illustrations. Post 8vo. price 15s.

MACNAUGHT (Rev. John)—CœNA DOMINI : An Essay on the Lord's Supper, its Primitive Institution, Apostolic Uses, and Subsequent History. Demy 8vo. price 14s.

MAIR (R. S.) M.D., F.R.C.S.E.—THE MEDICAL GUIDE FOR ANGLO-INDIANS. Being a Compendium of Advice to Europeans in India, relating to the Preservation and Regulation of Health. With a Supplement on the Management of Children in India. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. limp cloth, price 3s. 6d.

MANNING (His Eminence Cardinal)—ESSAYS ON RELIGION AND LITERATURE. By various Writers. Third Series. Demy 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE HOLY SEE. With an Appendix containing the Papal Allocution and a translation. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

THE TRUE STORY OF THE VATICAN COUNCIL. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

MARRIOTT (Maj.-Gen. W. F.) C.S.I.—A GRAMMAR OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

MAUGHAN (W. C.)—THE ALPS OF ARABIA ; or, Travels through Egypt, Sinai, Arabia, and the Holy Land. With Map. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. price 5s.

MAURICE (C. E.)—LIVES OF ENGLISH POPULAR LEADERS. No. 1.—STEPHEN LANGTON. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d. No. 2.—TYLER, BALL, and OLDCASTLE. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

MAZZINI (Joseph)—A Memoir. By E. A. V. Two Photographic Portraits. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

MEDLEY (Lieut.-Col. J. G.) R.E.—AN AUTUMN TOUR IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

MICKLETHWAITE (J. T.) F.S.A.—MODERN PARISH CHURCHES : Their Plan, Design, and Furniture. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

MILLER (Edward)—THE HISTORY AND DOCTRINES OF IRVINGISM ; or, the so-called Catholic and Apostolic Church. 2 vols. Large post 8vo. price 25s.

MILNE (James)—TABLES OF EXCHANGE for the Conversion of Sterling Money into Indian and Ceylon Currency, at Rates from 1s. 8d. to 2s. 3d. per Rupee. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. Cloth, price £2. 2s.

MIVART (St. George) F.R.S.—CONTEMPORARY EVOLUTION : An Essay on some recent Social Changes. Post 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

MOCKLER (E.)—A GRAMMAR OF THE BALOOCHEE LANGUAGE, as it is spoken in Makran (Ancient Gedrosia), in the Persia-Arabic and Roman characters. Fcap. 8vo. price 5s.

MOFFAT (R. S.)—ECONOMY OF CONSUMPTION : a Study in Political Economy. Demy 8vo. price 18s.

THE PRINCIPLES OF A TIME POLICY : being an Exposition of a Method of Settling Disputes between Employers and Employed in regard to Time and Wages, by a simple Process of Mercantile Barter, without recourse to Strikes or Locks-out. Reprinted from 'The Economy of Consumption,' with a Preface and Appendix containing Observations on some Reviews of that book, and a Re-criticism of the Theories of Ricardo and J. S. Mill on Rent, Value, and Cost of Production. Demy 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

MOLTKE (Field-Marshal Von)—LETTERS FROM RUSSIA. Translated by ROBINA NAPIER. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

MOORE (Rev. D.) M.A.—CHRIST AND HIS CHURCH. By the Author of 'The Age and the Gospel,' &c. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

MORE (R. Jasper)—UNDER THE BALKANS. Notes of a Visit to the District of Philippopolis in 1876. With a Map, and Illustrations from Photographs. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

MORELL (J. R.)—EUCLID SIMPLIFIED IN METHOD AND LANGUAGE. Being a Manual of Geometry. Compiled from the most important French Works, approved by the University of Paris and the Minister of Public Instruction. Fcap. 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

MORSE (E. S.) Ph.D.—FIRST BOOK OF ZOOLOGY. With numerous Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 5s..

MUSGRAVE (Anthony)—STUDIES IN POLITICAL ECONOMY. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

NEWMAN (J. H.) D.D.—CHARACTERISTICS FROM THE WRITINGS OF. Being Selections from his various Works. Arranged with the Author's personal Approval. Third Edition. With Portrait. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

* * A Portrait of the Rev. Dr. J. H. Newman, mounted for framing, can be had price 2s. 6d.

NICHOLAS (T.)—THE PEDIGREE OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE. Fifth Edition. Demy 8vo. price 16s.

NOBLE (J. A.)—THE PELICAN PAPERS. Reminiscences and Remains of a Dweller in the Wilderness. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

NORMAN PEOPLE (THE), and their Existing Descendants in the British Dominions and the United States of America. Demy 8vo. price 21s.

NOTREGE (John) A.M.—THE SPIRITUAL FUNCTION OF A PRESBYTER IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. Crown 8vo. red edges, price 3s. 6d.

O'MEARA (Kathleen.)—FREDERIC OZANAM, Professor of the Sorbonne: His Life and Work. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth.

ORIENTAL SPORTING MAGAZINE (THE). A Reprint of the first 5 Volumes, in 2 Volumes. Demy 8vo. price 28s.

PARKER (Joseph) D.D.—THE PARACLETE: An Essay on the Personality and Ministry of the Holy Ghost, with some reference to current discussions. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. price 12s.

PARSLOE (Joseph)—OUR RAILWAYS. Sketches, Historical and Descriptive. With Practical Information as to Fares and Rates, &c., and a Chapter on Railway Reform. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

PARR (Harriet)—ECHOES OF A FAMOUS YEAR. Crown 8vo. price 8s. 6d.

PAUL (C. Kegan)—WILLIAM GODWIN: HIS FRIENDS AND CONTEMPORARIES. With Portraits and Facsimiles of the Handwriting of Godwin and his Wife. 2 vols. Square post 8vo. price 28s.

THE GENIUS OF CHRISTIANITY UNVEILED. Being Essays by William Godwin never before published. Edited, with a Preface, by C. Kegan Paul. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

PAYNE (Prof. J. F.)—LECTURES ON EDUCATION. Price 6d. each.

II. Fröbel and the Kindergarten System. Second Edition.

A VISIT TO GERMAN SCHOOLS: ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN GERMANY. Notes of a Professional Tour to inspect some of the Kindergartens, Primary Schools, Public Girls' Schools, and Schools for Technical Instruction in Hamburg, Berlin, Dresden, Weimar, Gotha, Eisenach, in the autumn of 1874. With Critical Discussions of the General Principles and Practice of Kindergartens and other Schemes of Elementary Education. Crown 8vo. price 4s. 6d.

PENRICE (Maj. J.) B.A.—A DICTIONARY AND GLOSSARY OF THE KO-RAN. With Copious Grammatical References and Explanations of the Text. 4to. price 21s.

PERCEVAL (Rev. P.)—TAMIL PROVERBS, WITH THEIR ENGLISH TRANSLATION. Containing upwards of Six Thousand Proverbs. Third Edition. Demy 8vo. sewed, price 9s.

PESCHEL (Dr. Oscar)—THE RACES OF MAN AND THEIR GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION. Large crown 8vo. price 9s.

PIGGOT (J.) F.S.A., F.R.G.S.—PERSIA—ANCIENT AND MODERN. Post 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

PLAYFAIR (Lieut-Col.), Her Britannic Majesty's Consul-General in Algiers.

TRAVELS IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF BRUCE IN ALGERIA AND TUNIS. Illustrated by facsimiles of Bruce's original Drawings, Photographs, Maps, &c. Royal 4to. cloth, bevelled boards, gilt leaves, price £3. 3s.

POOR (H. V.)—MONEY AND ITS LAWS: embracing a History of Monetary Theories &c. Demy 8vo. price 21s.

POUSHKIN (A. S.)—RUSSIAN ROMANCE. Translated from the Tales of Belkin, &c. By Mrs. J. Buchan Telfer (*née* Mouravieff). Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

POWER (H.)—OUR INVALIDS: HOW SHALL WE EMPLOY AND AMUSE THEM? Fcp. 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

PRESBYTER—UNFOLDINGS OF CHRISTIAN HOPE. An Essay shewing that the Doctrine contained in the Damnatory Clauses of the Creed commonly called Athanasian is Unscriptural. Small crown 8vo. price 4s. 6d.

PRICE (Prof. Bonamy) — CURRENCY AND BANKING. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

CHAPTERS ON PRACTICAL POLITICAL ECONOMY. Being the Substance of Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford. Large post 8vo. price 12s.

PROCTOR (Richard A.) B.A.—OUR PLACE AMONG INFINITIES. A Series of Essays contrasting our little abode in space and time with the Infinities around us. To which are added Essays on 'Astrology,' and 'The Jewish Sabbath.' Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

THE EXPANSE OF HEAVEN. A Series of Essays on the Wonders of the Firmament. With a Frontispiece. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

PROTEUS AND AMADEUS. A Correspondence. Edited by AUBREY DE VERE. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

PUNJAUB (THE) AND NORTH-WESTERN FRONTIER OF INDIA. By an Old Punjaubee. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

RAM (James)—THE PHILOSOPHY OF WAR. Small crown 8vo. price 3s 6d

RAVENSHAW (John Henry) B.C.S.—GAUR: ITS RUINS AND INSCRIPTIONS. Edited by his Widow. With 40 Photographic Illustrations, and 14 facsimiles of Inscriptions. Royal 4to.

READ (Carveth)—ON THE THEORY OF LOGIC: An Essay. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

RIBOT (Prof. Th.)—ENGLISH PSYCHOLOGY. Second Edition. A Revised and Corrected Translation from the latest French Edition. Large post 8vo. price 9s.

HEREDITY: A Psychological Study on its Phenomena, its Laws, its Causes, and its Consequences. Large crown 8vo. price 9s.

RINK (Chevalier Dr. Henry)—GREENLAND: ITS PEOPLE AND ITS PRODUCTS. By the Chevalier Dr. HENRY RINK, President of the Greenland Board of Trade. With sixteen Illustrations, drawn by the Eskimo, and a Map. Edited by Dr. Robert Brown. Crown 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

RODWELL (G. F.) F.R.A.S., F.C.S.—ETNA: A HISTORY OF THE MOUNTAIN AND ITS ERUPTIONS. With Maps and Illustrations. Square 8vo. cloth.

ROBERTSON (The late Rev. F. W.) M.A., of Brighton.—LIFE AND LETTERS OF. Edited by the Rev. Stopford Brooke, M.A., Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.

I. Two vols., uniform with the Sermons. With Steel Portrait. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

II. Library Edition, in Demy 8vo. with Two Steel Portraits. Price 12s.

III. A Popular Edition, in 1 vol. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

SERMONS. Four Series. Small crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d. each.

NOTES ON GENESIS. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

EXPOSITORY LECTURES ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS. A New Edition. Small crown 8vo. price 5s.

LECTURES AND ADDRESSES, with other Literary Remains. A New Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

AN ANALYSIS OF MR. TENNYSON'S 'IN MEMORIAM.' (Dedicated by Permission to the Poet-Laureate.) Fcp. 8vo. price 2s.

THE EDUCATION OF THE HUMAN RACE. Translated from the German of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing. Fcp. 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

The above Works can also be had, bound in half-morocco.

* * * A Portrait of the late Rev. F. W. Robertson, mounted for framing, can be had, price 2s. 6d.

RUTHERFORD (John)—THE SECRET HISTORY OF THE FENIAN CONSPIRACY: its Origin, Objects, and Ramifications. 2 vols. Post 8vo. price 18s.

SCOTT (W. T.)—ANTIQUITIES OF AN ESSEX PARISH; or, Pages from the History of Great Dunmow. Crown 8vo. price 5s.; sewed, 4s.

SCOTT (Robert H.)—WEATHER CHARTS AND STORM WARNINGS. Illustrated. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

SENIOR (N. W.)—ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE. Correspondence and Conversations with Nassau W. Senior, from 1833 to 1859. Edited by M. C. M. Simpson. 2 vols. Large post 8vo. price 21s.

JOURNALS KEPT IN FRANCE AND ITALY. From 1848 to 1852. With a Sketch of the Revolution of 1848. Edited by his Daughter, M. C. M. Simpson. 2 vols. Post 8vo. price 24s.

SEYD (Ernest) F.S.S.—THE FALL IN THE PRICE OF SILVER. Its Causes, its Consequences, and their Possible Avoidance, with Special Reference to India. Demy 8vo. sewed, price 2s. 6d.

SHAKSPEARE (Charles)—SAINT PAUL AT ATHENS. Spiritual Christianity in relation to some aspects of Modern Thought. Five Sermons preached at St. Stephen's Church, Westbourne Park. With a Preface by the Rev. Canon FARRAR.

SHELLEY (Lady)—SHELLEY MEMORIALS FROM AUTHENTIC SOURCES. With (now first printed) an Essay on Christianity by Percy Bysshe Shelley. With Portrait. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

SHILLITO (Rev. Joseph)—WOMANHOOD: its Duties, Temptations, and Privileges. A Book for Young Women. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

SHIPLEY (Rev. Orby) M.A.—CHURCH TRACTS: OR, STUDIES IN MODERN PROBLEMS. By various Writers. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. price 5s. each.

PRINCIPLES OF THE FAITH IN RELATION TO SIN. Topics for Thought in Times of Retreat. Eleven Addresses delivered during a Retreat of Three Days to Persons living in the World. Demy 8vo.

SHUTE (Richard) M.A.—A DISCOURSE ON TRUTH. Large post 8vo. price 9s.

SMEDLEY (M. B.)—BOARDING-OUT AND PAUPER SCHOOLS FOR GIRLS. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

SMITH (Edward) M.D., LL.B., F.R.S.—HEALTH AND DISEASE, as Influenced by the Daily, Seasonal, and other Cyclical Changes in the Human System. A New Edition. Post 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

PRACTICAL DIETARY FOR FAMILIES, SCHOOLS, AND THE LABOURING CLASSES. A New Edition. Post 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

TUBERCULAR CONSUMPTION IN ITS EARLY AND REMEDIEABLE STAGES. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

SMITH (Hubert)—TENT LIFE WITH ENGLISH GIPSIES IN NORWAY. With Five full-page Engravings and Thirty-one smaller Illustrations by Whymper and others, and Map of the Country showing Routes. Third Edition. Revised and Corrected. Post 8vo. price 21s.

SOME TIME IN IRELAND. A Recollection. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

STEPHENS (Archibald John), LL.D.—THE FOLKESTONE RITUAL CASE. The Substance of the Argument delivered before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on behalf of the Respondents. Demy 8vo. cloth, price 6s.

STEVENSON (Rev. W. F.)—HYMNS FOR THE CHURCH AND HOME. Selected and Edited by the Rev. W. Fleming Stevenson.

The most complete Hymn Book published.

The Hymn Book consists of Three Parts:—I. For Public Worship.—II. For Family and Private Worship.—III. For Children.

* * Published in various forms and prices, the latter ranging from 8d. to 6s. Lists and full particulars will be furnished on application to the Publishers.

STEVENSON (Robert Louis)—AN INLAND VOYAGE. With Frontispiece by Walter Crane. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

SULLY (James) M.A.—SENSATION AND INTUITION. Demy 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

PESSIMISM: a History and a Criticism. Demy 8vo. price 14s.

SUPERNATURAL IN NATURE (THE). A Verification by Free Use of Science. Demy 8vo. price 14s.

SYME (David)—OUTLINES OF AN INDUSTRIAL SCIENCE. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

TELFER (J. Buchan) F.R.G.S., Commander R.N.—THE CRIMEA AND TRANS-CAUCASIA. With numerous Illustrations and Maps. Second Edition. 2 vols. Royal 8vo. medium 8vo. price 36s.

THOMPSON (Rev. A. S.)—HOME WORDS FOR WANDERERS. A Volume of Sermons. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

THOMSON (J. Turnbull)—SOCIAL PROBLEMS; OR, AN INQUIRY INTO THE LAWS OF INFLUENCE. With Diagrams. Demy 8vo. cloth.

TRAHERNE (Mrs. A.)—THE ROMANTIC ANNALS OF A NAVAL FAMILY. A New and Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

VAMBERY (Prof. A.)—BOKHARA: Its History and Conquest. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. price 18s.

VILLARI (Professor)—NICCOLO MACHIAVELLI AND HIS TIMES. Translated by Linda Villari. 2 vols. Large post 8vo.

VYNER (Lady Mary)—EVERY DAY A PORTION. Adapted from the Bible and the Prayer Book, for the Private Devotions of those living in Widowhood. Collected and Edited by Lady Mary Vyner. Square crown 8vo. extra, price 5s.

WALDSTEIN (Charles) Ph.D.—THE BALANCE OF EMOTION AND INTELLECT; an Introductory Essay to the Study of Philosophy. Crown 8vo. cloth.

WALLER (Rev. C. B.)—THE APOCALYPSE, reviewed under the Light of the Doctrine of the Unfolding Ages, and the Relation of All Things. Demy 8vo. price 12s.

WELLS (Capt. John C.) R.N.—SPITZBERGEN—THE GATEWAY TO THE POLYNIA; or, a Voyage to Spitzbergen. With numerous Illustrations by Whymper and others, and Map. New and Cheaper Edition. Demy 8vo. price 6s.

WETMORE (W. S.)—COMMERCIAL TELEGRAPHIC CODE. Second Edition. Post 4to. boards, price 42s.

WHITE (A. D.) LL.D.—WARFARE OF SCIENCE. With Prefatory Note by Professor Tyndall. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

WHITNEY (Prof. William Dwight)—ESSENTIALS OF ENGLISH GRAMMAR, for the Use of Schools. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

WHITTLE (J. L.) A.M.—CATHOLICISM AND THE VATICAN. With a Narrative of the Old Catholic Congress at Munich. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 4s. 6d.

WILBERFORCE (H. W.)—THE CHURCH AND THE EMPIRES. Historical Periods. Preceded by a Memoir of the Author by John Henry Newman, D.D. of the Oratory. With Portrait. Post 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

WILKINSON (T. L.)—**SHORT LECTURES ON THE LAND LAWS.** Delivered before the Working Men's College. Crown 8vo. limp cloth, price 2s.

WILLIAMS (A. Lukyn)—**FAMINES IN INDIA;** their Causes and Possible Prevention. The Essay for the Le Bas Prize, 1875. Demy 8vo. price 5s.

WILLIAMS (Chas.)—**THE ARMENIAN CAMPAIGN.** A Diary of the Campaign of 1877 in Armenia and Koordistan. Large post 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

WILLIAMS (Rowland) D.D.—**LIFE AND LETTERS OF;** with Extracts from his Note-Books. Edited by Mrs. Rowland Williams. With a Photographic Portrait. 2 vols. large post 8vo. price 24s.

PSALMS, LITANIES, COUNSELS, AND COLLECTS FOR DEVOUT PERSONS. Edited by his Widow. New and Popular Edition. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

STRAY THOUGHTS COLLECTED FROM THE WRITINGS OF THE LATE ROWLAND WILLIAMS, D.D. Edited by his Widow.

WILLIS (R.) M.D.—**SERVETUS AND CALVIN:** a Study of an Important Epoch in the Early History of the Reformation. 8vo. price 16s.

WILLIAM HARVEY. A History of the Discovery of the Circulation of the Blood : with a Portrait of Harvey after Faithorne. Demy 8vo. cloth.

WILSON (H. Schütz)—**STUDIES AND ROMANCES.** Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

WILSON (Lieut.-Col. C. T.)—**JAMES THE SECOND AND THE DUKE OF BERWICK.** Demy 8vo. price 12s. 6d.

WINTERBOTHAM (Rev. R.) M.A., B.Sc.—**SERMONS AND EXPOSITIONS.** Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

WOLLSTONECRAFT (Mary)—**LETTERS TO IMLAY.** New Edition with Prefatory Memoir by C. KEGAN PAUL, author of 'William Godwin : His Friends and Contemporaries,' &c. Crown 8vo.

WOOD (C. F.)—**A YACHTING CRUISE IN THE SOUTH SEAS.** With six Photographic Illustrations. Demy 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

WRIGHT (Rev. David) M.A.—**WAITING FOR THE LIGHT, AND OTHER SERMONS.** Crown 8vo. price 6s.

WYLD (R. S.) F.R.S.E.—**THE PHYSICS AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE SENSES;** or, the Mental and the Physical in their Mutual Relation. Illustrated by several Plates. Demy 8vo. price 16s.

YONGE (C. D.)—**HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION OF 1688.** Crown 8vo. price 6s.

YOUMANS (Eliza A.)—**AN ESSAY ON THE CULTURE OF THE OBSERVING POWERS OF CHILDREN,** especially in connection with the Study of Botany. Edited, with Notes and a Supplement, by Joseph Payne, F.C.P., Author of 'Lectures on the Science and Art of Education,' &c. Crown 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

FIRST BOOK OF BOTANY. Designed to Cultivate the Observing Powers of Children. With 300 Engravings. New and Enlarged Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

YOUMANS (Edward L.) M.D.—**A CLASS BOOK OF CHEMISTRY,** on the Basis of the New System. With 200 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

THE INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC SERIES.

I. FORMS OF WATER : a Familiar Exposition of the Origin and Phenomena of Glaciers. By J. Tyndall, LL.D., F.R.S. With 25 Illustrations. Seventh Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

II. PHYSICS AND POLITICS ; or, Thoughts on the Application of the Principles of 'Natural Selection' and 'Inheritance' to Political Society. By Walter Bagehot. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 4s.

III. FOODS. By Edward Smith, M.D., LL.B., F.R.S. With numerous Illustrations. Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

IV. MIND AND BODY : the Theories of their Relation. By Alexander Bain, LL.D. With Four Illustrations. Sixth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 4s.

V. THE STUDY OF SOCIOLOGY. By Herbert Spencer. Seventh Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

VI. ON THE CONSERVATION OF ENERGY. By Balfour Stewart, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S. With 14 Illustrations. Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

VII. ANIMAL LOCOMOTION; or, Walking, Swimming, and Flying. By J. B. Pettigrew, M.D., F.R.S., &c. With 130 Illustrations. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

VIII. RESPONSIBILITY IN MENTAL DISEASE. By Henry Maudsley, M.D. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

IX. THE NEW CHEMISTRY. By Professor J. P. Cooke, of the Harvard University. With 31 Illustrations. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

X. THE SCIENCE OF LAW. By Professor Sheldon Amos. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

XI. ANIMAL MECHANISM: a Treatise on Terrestrial and Aerial Locomotion. By Professor E. J. Marey. With 117 Illustrations. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

XII. THE DOCTRINE OF DESCENT AND DARWINISM. By Professor Oscar Schmidt (Strasburg University). With 26 Illustrations. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

XIII. THE HISTORY OF THE CONFLICT BETWEEN RELIGION AND SCIENCE. By J. W. Draper, M.D., LL.D. Eleventh Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

XIV. FUNGI: their Nature, Influences, Uses, &c. By M. C. Cooke, M.D., LL.D. Edited by the Rev. M. J. Berkeley, M.A., F.L.S. With numerous Illustrations. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

XV. THE CHEMICAL EFFECTS OF LIGHT AND PHOTOGRAPHY. By Dr. Hermann Vogel (Polytechnic Academy of Berlin). Translation thoroughly revised. With 100 Illustrations. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

XVI. THE LIFE AND GROWTH OF LANGUAGE. By William Dwight Whitney, Professor of Sanscrit and Comparative Philology in Yale College, Newhaven. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

XVII. MONEY AND THE MECHANISM OF EXCHANGE. By W. Stanley Jevons, M.A., F.R.S. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

XVIII. THE NATURE OF LIGHT. With a General Account of Physical Optics. By Dr. Eugene Lommel, Professor of Physics in the University of Erlangen. With 188 Illustrations and a Table of Spectra in Chromo-lithography. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

XIX. ANIMAL PARASITES AND MESSMATES. By Monsieur Van Beneden, Professor of the University of Louvain, Correspondent of the Institute of France. With 83 Illustrations. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

XX. FERMENTATION. By Professor Schützenberger, Director of the Chemical Laboratory at the Sorbonne. With 28 Illustrations. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

XXI. THE FIVE SENSES OF MAN. By Professor Bernstein, of the University of Halle. With 91 Illustrations. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

XXII. THE THEORY OF SOUND IN ITS RELATION TO MUSIC. By Professor Pietro Blaserna, of the Royal University of Rome. With numerous Illustrations. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

XXIII. STUDIES IN SPECTRUM ANALYSIS. By J. Norman Lockyer. F.R.S. With six photographic Illustrations of Spectra, and numerous engravings on Wood. Crown 8vo. Second Edition. Price 6s. 6d.

Forthcoming Volumes.

Prof. W. KINGDON CLIFFORD, M.A. The First Principles of the Exact Sciences explained to the Non-mathematical.

W. B. CARPENTER, LL.D., F.R.S. The Physical Geography of the Sea.

Sir JOHN LUBBOCK, Bart., F.R.S. On Ants and Bees.

Prof. W. T. THISELTON DYER, B.A., B.Sc. Form and Habit in Flowering Plants.

Prof. MICHAEL FOSTER, M.D. Protoplasm and the Cell Theory.

H. CHARLTON BASTIAN, M.D., F.R.S. The Brain as an Organ of Mind.

P. BERT (Professor of Physiology, Paris). Forms of Life and other Cosmical Conditions.

Prof. A. C. RAMSAY, LL.D., F.R.S. Earth Sculpture : Hills, Valleys, Mountains, Plains, Rivers, Lakes ; how they were Produced, and how they have been Destroyed.

Prof. T. H. HUXLEY. The Crayfish : an Introduction to the Study of Zoology.

The Rev. A. SECCHI, D.J., late Director of the Observatory at Rome. The Stars.

Prof. J. ROSENTHAL, of the University of Erlangen. General Physiology of Muscles and Nerves.

Prof. A. DE QUATREFAGES, Membre de l'Institut. The Human Race.

Prof. THURSTON. The Steam Engine. With numerous Engravings.

FRANCIS GALTON, F.R.S. Psychometry.

J. W. JUDD, F.R.S. The Laws of Volcanic Action.

Prof. F. N. BALFOUR. The Embryonic Phases of Animal Life.

J. LUYS, Physician to the Hospice de la Salpêtrière. The Brain and its Functions. With Illustrations.

Dr. CARL SEMPER. Animals and their Conditions of Existence.

Prof. WURTZ. Atoms and the Atomic Theory.

GEORGE J. ROMANES, F.L.S. Animal Intelligence.

ALFRED W. BENNETT. A Handbook of Cryptogamic Botany.

MILITARY WORKS.

ANDERSON (Col. R. P.)—VICTORIES AND DEFEATS : an Attempt to explain the Causes which have led to them. An Officer's Manual. Demy 8vo. price 14s.

ARMY OF THE NORTH GERMAN CONFEDERATION : a Brief Description of its Organisation, of the Different Branches of the Service and their rôle in War, of its Mode of Fighting, &c. Translated from the Corrected Edition, by permission of the Author, by Colonel Edward Newdigate. Demy 8vo. price 5s.

BLUME (Maj. W.)—THE OPERATIONS OF THE GERMAN ARMIES IN FRANCE, from Sedan to the end of the War of 1870-71. With Map. From the Journals of the Head-quarters Staff. Translated by the late E. M. Jones, Maj. 20th Foot, Prof. of Mil. Hist., Sandhurst. Demy 8vo. price 9s.

BOGUSLAWSKI (Capt. A. von)—TACTICAL DEDUCTIONS FROM THE WAR OF 1870-1. Translated by Colonel Sir Lumley Graham, Bart., late 18th (Royal Irish) Regiment. Third Edition, Revised and Corrected. Demy 8vo. price 7s.

BRACKENBURY (*Lieut.-Col.*) *C.B., R.A., A.A.G. MILITARY HANDBOOKS FOR REGIMENTAL OFFICERS.* I. Military Sketching and Reconnaissance, by Lieut.-Col. F. J. Hutchison, and Capt. H. G. MacGregor. With 15 Plates. Small 8vo. cloth, price 6s. II. The Elements of Modern Tactics, by Major Wilkinson Shaw. With numerous Plates.

BRIALMONT (*Col. A.*)—**HASTY TRENCHMENTS.** Translated by Lieut. Charles A. Empson, R.A. With Nine Plates. Demy 8vo. price 6s.

CLERY (*C.*) *Capt.—MINOR TACTICS.* With 26 Maps and Plans. Third and revised Edition. Demy 8vo. cloth, price 16s.

DU VERNOIS (*Col. von Verdy*)—**STUDIES IN LEADING TROOPS.** An authorised and accurate Translation by Lieutenant H. J. T. Hildyard, 71st Foot. Parts I. and II. Demy 8vo. price 7s.

GOETZE (*Capt. A. von*)—**OPERATIONS OF THE GERMAN ENGINEERS DURING THE WAR OF 1870-1.** Published by Authority, and in accordance with Official Documents. Translated from the German by Colonel G. Graham, V.C., C.B., R.E. With 6 large Maps. Demy 8vo. price 21s.

HARRISON (*Lieut.-Col. R.*) — **THE OFFICER'S MEMORANDUM BOOK FOR PEACE AND WAR.** Second Edition. Oblong 32mo. roan, elastic band and pencil, price 3s. 6d.; russia, 5s.

HELVIG (*Capt. H.*)—**THE OPERATIONS OF THE BAVARIAN ARMY CORPS.** Translated by Captain G. S. Schwabe. With Five large Maps. In 2 vols. Demy 8vo. price 24s.

TACTICAL EXAMPLES: Vol. I. The Battalion, price 15s. Vol. II. The Regiment and Brigade, price 10s. 6d. Translated from the German by Col. Sir Lumley Graham. With nearly 300 Diagrams. Demy 8vo. cloth.

HOFFBAUER (*Capt.*)—**THE GERMAN ARTILLERY IN THE BATTLES NEAR METZ.** Based on the Official Reports of the German Artillery. Translated by Captain E. O. Hollist. With Map and Plans. Demy 8vo. price 21s.

LAYMANN (*Capt.*)—**THE FRONTAL ATTACK OF INFANTRY.** Translated by Colonel Edward Newdigate. Crown 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

NOTES ON CAVALRY TACTICS, ORGANISATION, &c. By a Cavalry Officer. With Diagrams. Demy 8vo. cloth, price 12s.

PAGE (*Capt. S. F.*)—**DISCIPLINE AND DRILL.** Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. price 1s.

PUBLIC SCHOOLBOY: the Volunteer, the Militiaman, and the Regular Soldier. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 5s.

RUSSELL (*Major Frank S.*)—**RUSSIAN WARS WITH TURKEY, PAST AND PRESENT.** With Maps. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

SCHELL (*Maj. von*)—**THE OPERATIONS OF THE FIRST ARMY UNDER GEN. VON GOEBEN.** Translated by Col. C. H. von Wright. Four Maps. demy 8vo. price 9s.

THE OPERATIONS OF THE FIRST ARMY UNDER GEN. VON STEINMETZ. Translated by Captain E. O. Hollist. Demy 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

SCHELLENDORF (*Major-Gen. B. von*)—**THE DUTIES OF THE GENERAL STAFF.** Translated from the German by Lieutenant Hare. Vol. I. Demy 8vo. cloth, 10s. 6d.

SCHERFF (*Maj. W. von*)—**STUDIES IN THE NEW INFANTRY TACTICS.** Parts I. and II. Translated from the German by Colonel Lumley Graham. Demy 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

SHADWELL (*Maj.-Gen.*) *C.B.—MOUNTAIN WARFARE.* Illustrated by the Campaign of 1799 in Switzerland. Being a Translation of the Swiss Narrative compiled from the Works of the Archduke Charles, Jomini, and others. Also of Notes by General H. Dufour on the Campaign of the Valtelline in 1635. With Appendix, Maps, and Introductory Remarks. Demy 8vo. price 16s.

SHERMAN (*Gen. W. T.*)—**MEMOIRS OF GENERAL W. T. SHERMAN,** Commander of the Federal Forces in the American Civil War. By Himself. 2 vols. With Map. Demy 8vo. price 24s. Copyright English Edition.

STUBBS (*Lieut.-Col. F. W.*) — THE REGIMENT OF BENGAL ARTILLERY. The History of its Organisation, Equipment, and War Services. Compiled from Published Works, Official Records, and various Private Sources. With numerous Maps and Illustrations. 2 vols. demy 8vo. price 32s.

STUMM (*Lieut. Hugo*), German Military Attaché to the Khivan Expedition.—RUSSIA'S ADVANCE EASTWARD. Based on the Official Reports of. Translated by Capt. C. E. H. VINCENT, With Map. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

VINCENT (*Capt. C. E. H.*) — ELEMENTARY MILITARY GEOGRAPHY, RECONNOITRING, AND SKETCHING. Compiled for Non-commissioned Officers and Soldiers of all Arms. Square crown 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

WHITE (*Capt. F. B. P.*) — THE SUBSTANTIVE SENIORITY ARMY LIST—MAJORS AND CAPTAINS. 8vo. sewed, price 2s. 6d.

WARTENSLEBEN (*Count H. von.*) — THE OPERATIONS OF THE SOUTH ARMY IN JANUARY AND FEBRUARY, 1871. Compiled from the Official War Documents of the Head-quarters of the Southern Army. Translated by Colonel C. H. von Wright. With Maps. Demy 8vo. price 6s.

THE OPERATIONS OF THE FIRST ARMY UNDER GEN. VON MANTEUFFEL. Translated by Colonel C. H. von Wright. Uniform with the above. Demy 8vo. price 9s.

WICKHAM (*Capt. E. H., R.A.*) — INFLUENCE OF FIREARMS UPON TACTICS : Historical and Critical Investigations. By an OFFICER OF SUPERIOR RANK (in the German Army). Translated by Captain E. H. Wickham, R.A. Demy 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

WOINOVITS (*Capt. J.*) — AUSTRIAN CAVALRY EXERCISE. Translated by Captain W. S. Cooke. Crown 8vo. price 7s.

POETRY.

ABBEY (*Henry*) — BALLADS OF GOOD DEEDS, and other Verses. Fcp. 8vo. cloth gilt, price 5s.

ADAMS (*W. D.*) — LYRICS OF LOVE, from Shakespeare to Tennyson. Selected and arranged by. Fcp. 8vo. cloth extra, gilt edges, price 3s. 6d.

Also, a Cheaper Edition. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, 2s. 6d.

ADAMS (*John*) *M.A.* — ST. MALO'S QUEST, and other Poems. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

ADON — THROUGH STORM AND SUNSHINE. Illustrated by M. E. Edwards, A. T. H. Paterson, and the Author. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

A. J. R. — TOLD IN TWILIGHT ; Stories in Verse, Songs, &c. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

AUBERTIN (*J. J.*) — CAMOENS' LUSIADS. Portuguese Text, with Translation by. Map and Portraits. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. price 30s.

AURORA : a Volume of Verse. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 5s

BARING (*T. C.*) *M.A., M.P.* — PINDAR IN ENGLISH RHYME. Being an Attempt to render the Epinikian Odes with the principal remaining Fragments of Pindar into English Rhymed Verse. Small 4to. price 7s.

BAYNES (*Rev. Canon R. H.*) *M.A.* — HOME SONGS FOR QUIET HOURS. Fourth Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 2s. 6d. This may also be had handsomely bound in morocco with gilt edges.

BENNETT (*Dr. W. C.*) — NARRATIVE POEMS AND BALLADS. Fcp. 8vo. sewed, in Coloured Wrapper, price 1s. SONGS FOR SAILORS. Dedicated by Special Request to H.R.H. the Duke of Edinburgh. With Steel Portrait and Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

An Edition in Illustrated Paper Covers, price 1s.

SONGS OF A SONG WRITER. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

BOSWELL (*R. B.*) *M.A. Oxon.* — METRICAL TRANSLATIONS FROM THE GREEK AND LATIN POETS, and other Poems. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

BRYANT (W. C.)—POEMS. Red-line Edition. With 24 Illustrations and Portrait of the Author. Crown 8vo. cloth extra, price 7s. 6d.

A Cheap Edition, with Frontispiece. Small crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

BUCHANAN (Robt.)—POETICAL WORKS. Collected Edition, in 3 vols. with Portrait. Crown 8vo. price 6s. each.

MASTER-SPIRITS. Post 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

BULKELEY (Rev. H. J.)—WALLED IN, and other Poems. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

CALDERON'S DRAMAS: the Wonder-Working Magician—Life is a Dream—the Purgatory of St. Patrick. Translated by Denis Florence MacCarthy. Post 8vo. price 10s.

CARPENTER (E.)—NARCISSUS, and other Poems. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

COLLINS (Mortimer)—INN OF STRANGE MEETINGS, and other Poems. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 5s.

CORY (Lieut.-Col. Arthur)—IONE: a Poem in Four Parts. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 5s.

COSMOS: a Poem. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

CRESSWELL (Mrs. G.)—THE KING'S BANNER: Drama in Four Acts. Five Illustrations. 4to. price 10s. 6d.

DENNIS (J.)—ENGLISH SONNETS. Collected and Arranged. Elegantly bound. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

DE VERE (Aubrey)—ALEXANDER THE GREAT: a Dramatic Poem. Small crown 8vo. price 5s.

THE INFANT BRIDAL, and other Poems. A New and Enlarged Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

THE LEGENDS OF ST. PATRICK, and other Poems. Small crown 8vo. price 5s.

ST. THOMAS OF CANTERBURY: a Dramatic Poem. Large fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

ANTAR AND ZARA: an Eastern Romance. INISFAIL, and other Poems, Meditative and Lyrical. Fcp. 8vo. price 6s.

THE FALL OF RÓRA, THE SEARCH AFTER PROSERPINE, and other Poems, Meditative and Lyrical. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

DOBSON (Austin)—VIGNETTES IN RHYME, and Vers de Société. Third Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

PROVERBS IN PORCELAIN. By the Author of 'Vignettes in Rhyme.' Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

DOWDEN (Edward) *LL.D.*—POEMS. Third Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

DOWNTON (Rev. H.) *M.A.*—HYMNS AND VERSES. Original and Translated. Small crown 8vo. cloth, price 3s. 6d.

DURAND (Lady)—IMITATIONS FROM THE GERMAN OF SPITTA AND TER-STEGEN. Fcp. 8vo. price 4s.

EDWARDS (Rev. Basil)—MINOR CHORDS; or, Songs for the Suffering: a Volume of Verse. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 3s. 6d.; paper, price, 2s. 6d.

ELLIOT (Lady Charlotte)—MEDUSA and other Poems. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 6s.

ELLIOTT (Ebenezer), The Corn Law Rhymer.—POEMS. Edited by his son, the Rev. Edwin Elliott, of St. John's, Antigua, 2 vols. crown 8vo. price 18s.

EPIC OF HADES (THE). By the Author of 'Songs of Two Worlds.' Fifth and finally revised Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

EROS AGONISTES: Poems. By E. B. D. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

EYRE (Maj.-Gen. Sir V.) *C.B., K.C.S.I., &c.*—LAYS OF A KNIGHT-ERRANT IN MANY LANDS. Square crown 8vo. with Six Illustrations, price 7s. 6d.

FERRIS (Henry Weybridge)—POEMS. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

GARDNER (H.)—SUNFLOWERS: a Book of Verses. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

G. H. T.—VERSES, mostly written in India. Crown 8vo, cloth, price 6s.

GOLDIE (Lieut. M. H. G.)—HEBE: a Tale. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

HARCOURT (Capt. A. F. P.)—THE SHAKESPEARE ARGOSY. Containing much of the wealth of Shakespeare's Wisdom and Wit, alphabetically arranged and classified. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

HEWLETT (Henry G.)—A SHEAF OF VERSE. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

HOLMES (E. G. A.)—POEMS. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

HOWARD (Rev. G. B.)—AN OLD LEGEND OF ST. PAUL'S. Fcp. 8vo. price 4s. 6d.

HOWELL (James)—A TALE OF THE SEA, Sonnets, and other Poems. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

HUGHES (Allison)—PENELOPE, and other Poems. Fcp. 8vo. price 4s. 6d.

INCHBOLD (J. W.)—ANNUS AMORIS : Sonnets. Fcp. 8vo. price 4s. 6d.

KING (Mrs. Hamilton)—THE DISCIPLES: a New Poem. Third Edition, with some Notes. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

ASPRONANTE, and other Poems. Second Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 4s. 6d.

KNIGHT (A. F. C.)—POEMS. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

LADY OF LIPARI (THE) : a Poem in Three Cantos. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

LOCKER (F.)—LONDON LYRICS. A New and Revised Edition, with Additions and a Portrait of the Author. Crown 8vo. cloth elegant, price 6s.

Also, an Edition for the People. Fcp. 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

LUCAS (Alice)—TRANSLATIONS FROM THE WORKS OF GERMAN POETS OF THE 18TH AND 19TH CENTURIES. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

MAGNUSSON (Eirikr) M.A., and PALMER (E. H.) M.A.—JOHAN LUDVIG RUNEBERG'S LYRICAL SONGS, IDYLLS, AND EPIGRAMS. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 5s.

MIDDLETON (The Lady)—BALLADS. Square 16mo. cloth, price 3s. 6d.

MILLER (Robert)—THE ROMANCE OF LOVE. Fcp. cloth, price 5s.

MORICE (Rev. F. D.) M.A.—THE OLYMPIAN AND PYTHIAN ODES OF PINDAR. A New Translation in English Verse. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

MORSHEAD (E. D. A.)—THE AGAMEMNON OF AESCHYLUS. Translated into English Verse. With an Introductory Essay. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 5s.

NEW WRITER (A)—SONGS OF TWO WORLDS. Third Edition. Complete in One Volume. With Portrait. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

THE EPIC OF HADES. By the Author of 'Songs of Two Worlds.' Fourth and finally revised Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

NICHOLSON (Edward B.) Librarian of the London Institution—THE CHRIST CHILD, and other Poems. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 4s. 6d.

NOAKE (Major R. Compton)—THE BIVOUAC ; or, Martial Lyrist. With an Appendix : Advice to the Soldier. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s. 6d.

NORRIS (Rev. Alfred)—THE INNER AND OUTER LIFE POEMS. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 6s.

PAUL (C. Kegan)—GOETHE'S FAUST. A New Translation in Rhyme. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

PAYNE (John)—SONGS OF LIFE AND DEATH. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 5s.

PEACOCKE (Georgiana)—RAYS FROM THE SOUTHERN CROSS : Poems. Crown 8vo. with Sixteen Full-page Illustrations by the Rev. P. Walsh. Crown 8vo. cloth elegant, price 10s. 6d.

PENNELL (H. Cholmondeley)—PEGASUS RESADDLED. By the Author of 'Puck on Pegasus,' &c. &c. With Ten Full-page Illustrations by George Du Maurier. Second Edition. Fcp. 4to. cloth elegant, 12s. 6d.

PFEIFFER (Emily)—GLAN ALARCH : His Silence and Song : a Poem. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

GERARD'S MONUMENT and other Poems. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 6s.

POEMS. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 6s.

POWLETT (Lieut. N.) R.A.—EASTERN LEGENDS AND STORIES IN ENGLISH VERSE. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

RHOADES (James)—TIMOLEON : a Dramatic Poem. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

ROBINSON (A. Mary F.)—A HANDFUL OF HONEYSUCKLE. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 3s. 6d.

SCOTT (Patrick) — THE DREAM AND THE DEED, and other Poems. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

SONGS OF TWO WORLDS. By the Author of 'The Epic of Hades.' Fourth Edition. Complete in one Volume, with Portrait. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 7s. 6d.

SONGS FOR MUSIC. By Four Friends. Containing Songs by Reginald A. Gatty, Stephen H. Gatty, Greville J. Chester, and Juliana Ewing. Square crown 8vo. price 5s.

SPICER (H.) — OTHO'S DEATH WAGER : a Dark Page of History Illustrated. In Five Acts. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 5s.

STAPLETON (John) — THE THAMES : a Poem. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

STONEHEWER (Agnes) — MONACELLA: a Legend of North Wales. A Poem. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 3s. 6d.

SWEET SILVERY SAYINGS OF SHAKESPEARE. Crown 8vo. cloth gilt, price 7s. 6d.

TAYLOR (Rev. J. W. A.) M.A. — POEMS. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

TAYLOR (Sir H.) — Works Complete in Five Volumes. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 30s.

TENNYSON (Alfred) — Works Complete:—

THE IMPERIAL LIBRARY EDITION. Complete in 7 vols. demy 8vo. price 10s. 6d. each; in Roxburgh binding, 12s. 6d. (*See p. 32.*)

AUTHOR'S EDITION. In Six Volumes. Post 8vo. cloth gilt; or half-morocco. Roxburgh style. (*See p. 32.*)

CABINET EDITION. 12 Volumes. Each with Frontispiece. Fcp. 8vo. price 2s. 6d. each. (*See p. 32.*)

CABINET EDITION. 12 vols. Complete in handsome Ornamental Case. (*See p. 32.*)

POCKET VOLUME EDITION. 13 vols. in neat case, price 36s. Ditto, ditto. Extra cloth gilt, in case, price 42s. (*See p. 32.*)

THE GUINEA EDITION OF THE POETICAL AND DRAMATIC WORKS, complete in 12 vols. neatly bound and enclosed in box. Cloth, price 21s.; French morocco, price 31s. 6d.

TENNYSON (Alfred) — cont.

SHILLING EDITION OF THE POETICAL WORKS. In 12 vols. pocket size, 1s. each, sewed.

THE CROWN EDITION. Complete in 1 vol. strongly bound in cloth, price 6s.; cloth, extra gilt leaves, price 7s. 6d.; Roxburgh, half-morocco, price 7s. 6d.

* * Can also be had in a variety of other bindings.

Original Editions:—

POEMS. Small 8vo. price 6s.

MAUD, and other Poems. Small 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

THE PRINCESS. Small 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

IDYLLS OF THE KING. Small 8vo. price 5s.

IDYLLS OF THE KING. Complete. Small 8vo. price 6s.

THE HOLY GRAIL, and other Poems. Small 8vo. price 4s. 6d.

GARETH AND LYNNETTE. Small 8vo. price 3s.

ENOCH ARDEN, &c. Small 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

IN MEMORIAM. Small 8vo. price 4s.

HAROLD : a Drama. New Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

QUEEN MARY : a Drama. New Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

SELECTIONS FROM THE ABOVE WORKS. Super royal 16mo. price 3s. 6d.; cloth gilt extra, price 4s.

SONGS FROM THE ABOVE WORKS. 16mo. cloth, price 2s. 6d.; cloth extra, 3s. 6d.

TENNYSON'S IDYLLS OF THE KING, and other Poems. Illustrated by Julia Margaret Cameron. 2 vols. folio. half-bound morocco, cloth sides, price £6. 6s. each.

TENNYSON FOR THE YOUNG AND FOR RECITATION. Specially arranged. Fcp. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

THE TENNYSON BIRTHDAY BOOK. Edited by Emily Shakespear. 32mo. cloth limp, 2s.; cloth extra, 3s.

THOMPSON (Alice C.)—PRELUDES : a Volume of Poems. Illustrated by Elizabeth Thompson (Painter of 'The Roll Call'). 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

THOUGHTS IN VERSE. Small crown 8vo. price 1s. 6d.

THRING (Rev. Godfrey), B.A.—HYMNS AND SACRED LYRICS. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

TODD (Herbert) M.A.—ARVAN ; or, the Story of the Sword. A Poem. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

TODHUNTER (Dr. J.)—LAURELLA, and other Poems. Crown 8vo. price 6s. 6d.

TURNER (Rev. C. Tennyson)—SONNETS, LYRICS, AND TRANSLATIONS. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 4s. 6d.

WATERFIELD (W.)—HYMNS FOR HOLY DAYS AND SEASONS. 32mo. cloth, price 1s. 6d.

WAY (A.) M.A.—THE ODES OF HORACE LITERALLY TRANSLATED IN METRE. Fcp. 8vo. price 2s.

WILLOUGHBY (The Hon. Mrs.)—ON THE NORTH WIND—THISTLEDOWN : a Volume of Poems. Elegantly bound, small crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

LIBRARY NOVELS.

BLUE ROSES ; or, Helen Malinofská's Marriage. By the Author of 'Véra.' Fifth Edition. 2 vols. cloth, gilt tops, 12s.

CHAPMAN (Hon. Mrs. E. W.)—A CONSTANT HEART : a Story. 2 vols. cloth, gilt tops, 12s.

HOCKLEY (W. B.)—TALES OF THE ZENANA ; or, a Nuwab's Leisure Hours. By the Author of 'Pandu-rang Hari.' With a Preface by Lord Stanley of Alderley. 2 vols. crown 8vo. cloth, price 21s.

MASTERMAN (J.)—WORTH WAITING FOR : a New Novel. 3 vols. crown 8vo. cloth.

MORLEY (Susan)—MARGARET CHET-WYND : a Novel. 3 vols. crown 8vo.

PAUL (Margaret Agnes)—GENTLE AND SIMPLE : a Story. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. gilt tops, price 12s.

SHAW (Flora L.)—CASTLE BLAIR : a Story of Youthful Lives. 2 vols. crown 8vo. cloth, price 12s.

STRETTON (Miss Hesba)—THROUGH A NEEDLE'S EYE. 2 vols. crown 8vo. gilt tops, price 12s.

TAYLOR (Colonel Meadows) C.S.I., M.R.I.A.—SEETA : a Novel. 3 vols. crown 8vo.

A NOBLE QUEEN. 3 vols. crown 8vo.

WITHIN SOUND OF THE SEA. By the Author of 'Vera,' &c. &c. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. gilt tops, price 12s.

WORKS OF FICTION IN ONE VOLUME.

BETHAM-EDWARDS (Miss M.) KITTY. With a Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

BLUE ROSES ; or, Helen Malinofská's Marriage. By the Author of 'Véra.' New and Cheaper Edition. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 6s.

CLERK (Mrs. Godfrey)—'ILÂM EN NÂS : Historical Tales and Anecdotes of the Times of the Early Khalifahs. Translated from the Arabic Originals. Illustrated with Historical and Explanatory Notes. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 7s.

GARRETT (E.)—BY STILL WATERS : a Story for Quiet Hours. With Seven Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

HARDY (Thomas)—A PAIR OF BLUE EYES. Author of 'Far from the Madding Crowd.' New Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

HOWARD (Mary M.)—BEATRICE AYLMER, and other Tales. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

IGNOTUS—CULMSHIRE FOLK: a Novel. New and Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

MACDONALD (G.)—MALCOLM. With Portrait of the Author engraved on Steel. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

THE MARQUIS OF LOSSIE. Second Edition. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 6s.

ST. GEORGE AND ST. MICHAEL. Second Edition. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. cloth, 6s.

MEREDITH (George)—*ORDEAL OF RICHARD FEVEREL*. New Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 6s.

PALGRAVE (W. Gifford)—*HERMANN AGHA*: an Eastern Narrative. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 6s.

PANDURANG HARI; or, Memoirs of a Hindoo. With an Introductory Preface by Sir H. Bartle E. Frere, G.C.S.I., C.B. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

PAUL (Margaret Agnes)—*GENTLE AND SIMPLE*: A Story. New and Cheaper Edition, with Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

SAUNDERS (John)—*ISRAEL MORT, OVERMAN*: a Story of the Mine. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

SAUNDERS (Katherine)—*GIDEON'S ROCK*, and other Stories. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

SAUNDERS (Katherine)—cont.

JOAN MERRYWEATHER, and other Stories. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

MARGARET AND ELIZABETH: a Story of the Sea. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

SHAW (Flora L.)—*CASTLE BLAIR*; a Story of Youthful Lives. New and Cheaper Edition, with Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

TAYLOR (Col. Meadows) C.S.I., M.R.I.A. *THE CONFESSIONS OF A THUG*. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

TARA: a Mahratta Tale. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

CORNHILL LIBRARY of FICTION (The). Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d. per volume.

HALF-A-DOZEN DAUGHTERS. By J. Masterman.

THE HOUSE OF RABY. By Mrs. G. Hooper.

A FIGHT FOR LIFE. By Moy Thomas.

ROBIN GRAY. By Charles Gibbon.

ONE OF TWO; or, *The Left-Handed Bride*. By J. Hain Friswell.

GOD'S PROVIDENCE HOUSE. By Mrs. G. L. Banks. New Edition.

FOR LACK OF GOLD. By Charles Gibbon.

ABEL DRAKE'S WIFE. By John Saunders.

HIRELL. By John Saunders.

CHEAP FICTION.

GIBBON (Charles)—*FOR LACK OF GOLD*. With a Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. Illustrated Boards, price 2s.

ROBIN GRAY. With a Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. Illustrated boards, price 2s.

SAUNDERS (John)—*HIRELL*. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. Illustrated boards, price 2s.

ABEL DRAKE'S WIFE. With Frontispiece. Illustrated boards, price 2s.

BOOKS FOR THE YOUNG.

AUNT MARY'S BRAN PIE. By the Author of 'St. Olave's.' Illustrated. Price 3s. 6d.

BARLEE (Ellen)—*LOCKED OUT*: a Tale of the Strike. With a Frontispiece. Royal 16mo. price 1s. 6d.

BONWICK (J.) F.R.G.S.—*THE TASMANIAN LILY*. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

MIKE HOWE, the Bushranger of Van Diemen's Land. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

BRAVE MEN'S FOOTSTEPS. By the Editor of 'Men who have Risen.' A Book of Example and Anecdote for Young People. With Four Illustrations by C. Doyle. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

CHILDREN'S TOYS, and some Elementary Lessons in General Knowledge which they teach. Illustrated. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 5s.

COLERIDGE (Sara) — PRETTY LESSONS IN VERSE FOR GOOD CHILDREN, with some Lessons in Latin, in Easy Rhyme. A New Edition. Illustrated. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 3s. 6d.

D'ANVERS (N. R.) — LITTLE MINNIE'S TROUBLES : an Every-day Chronicle. With 4 Illustrations by W. H. Hughes. Fcp. cloth, price 3s. 6d.

PIXIE'S ADVENTURES ; or, the Tale of a Terrier. With 21 Illustrations. 16mo. cloth, price 4s. 6d.

NANNY. With numerous Illustrations. Square 16mo. cloth.

DAVIES (G. Christopher) — MOUNTAIN, MEADOW, AND MERE : a Series of Outdoor Sketches of Sport, Scenery, Adventures, and Natural History. With Sixteen Illustrations by Bosworth W. Harcourt. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

RAMBLES AND ADVENTURES OF OUR SCHOOL FIELD CLUB. With Four Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

DRUMMOND (Miss) — TRIPP'S BUILDINGS. A Study from Life, with Frontispiece. Small crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

EDMONDS (Herbert) — WELL SPENT LIVES : a Series of Modern Biographies. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

EVANS (Mark) — THE STORY OF OUR FATHER'S LOVE, told to Children; being a New and Enlarged Edition of Theology for Children. With Four Illustrations. Fcap. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

FARQUHARSON (M.)

I. ELSIE DINSMORE. Crown 8vo.
price 3s. 6d.

II. ELSIE'S GIRLHOOD. Crown 8vo.
price 3s. 6d.

III. ELSIE'S HOLIDAYS AT ROSELANDS. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

HERFORD (Brooke) — THE STORY OF RELIGION IN ENGLAND : a Book for Young Folk. Cr. 8vo. cloth, price 5s.

INGELOW (Jean) — THE LITTLE WONDER-HORN. With Fifteen Illustrations. Small 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

KER (David) — THE BOY SLAVE IN BOKHARA : a Tale of Central Asia. With Illustrations. Cr. 8vo. price 5s.

THE WILD HORSEMAN OF THE PAMPAS. Illustrated. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

LEANDER (Richard) — FANTASTIC STORIES. Translated from the German by Paulina B. Granville. With Eight Full-page Illustrations by M. E. Fraser-Tytler. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

LEE (Holme) — HER TITLE OF HONOUR. A Book for Girls. New Edition. With a Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

LEWIS (Mary A.) — A RAT WITH THREE TALES. With Four Illustrations by Catherine F. Frere. Price 5s.

LITTLE MINNIE'S TROUBLES : an Every-day Chronicle. With Four Illustrations by W. H. Hughes. Fcap. price 3s. 6d.

MIC CLINTOCK (L.) — SIR SPANGLE AND THE DINGY HEN. Illustrated. Square crown 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

MAC KENNA (S. J.) — PLUCKY FELLOWS. A Book for Boys. With Six Illustrations. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

AT SCHOOL WITH AN OLD DRAGOON. With Six Illustrations. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

MALDEN (H. E.) — PRINCES AND PRINCESSES : Two Fairy Tales. Illustrated. Small crown 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

MASTER BOBBY. By the Author of "Christina North." With Six Illustrations. Fcp. 8vo. cloth.

NAAKE (J. T.)—SLAVONIC FAIRY TALES. From Russian, Servian, Polish, and Bohemian Sources. With Four Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

PELLETAN (E.)—THE DESERT PASTOR. JEAN JAROUSSSEAU. Translated from the French. By Colonel E. P. De L'Hoste. With a Frontispiece. New Edition. Fcap. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

REANEY (Mrs. G. S.)—WAKING AND WORKING; or, From Girlhood to Womanhood. With a Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

BLESSING AND BLESSED: a Story of Girl Life. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 5s.

ENGLISH GIRLS: Their Place and Power. With Preface by the Rev. R. W. Dale.

SUNBEAM WILLIE, and other Stories. Three Illustrations. Royal 16mo. price 1s. 6d.

SUNSHINE JENNY and other Stories. 3 Illustrations. Royal 16mo. cloth, price 1s. 6d.

ROSS (Mrs. E.), ('Nelsie Brook')—**DADDY'S PET.** A Sketch from Humble Life. With Six Illustrations. Royal 16mo. price 1s.

SADLER (S. W.) R.N.—THE AFRICAN CRUISER: a Midshipman's Adventures on the West Coast. With Three Illustrations. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

SEEKING HIS FORTUNE, and other Stories. With Four Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

SEVEN AUTUMN LEAVES FROM FAIRY LAND. Illustrated with Nine Etchings. Square crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

STORR (Francis) and TURNER (Hawes). —**CANTERBURY CHIMES;** or, Chaucer Tales retold to Children. With Six Illustrations from the Ellesmere MS. Fcap. 8vo. cloth.

STRETTON (Hesba), Author of 'Jessica's First Prayer.'

MICHEL LORIO'S CROSS and other Stories. With Two Illustrations. Royal 16mo. price 1s. 6d.

THE STORM OF LIFE. With Ten Illustrations. Twenty-first Thousand. Royal 16mo. price 1s. 6d.

STRETTON (Hesba)—cont.

THE CREW OF THE DOLPHIN. Illustrated. Fourteenth Thousand. Royal 16mo. price 1s. 6d.

CASSY. Thirty-eighth Thousand. With Six Illustrations. Royal 16mo. price 1s. 6d.

THE KING'S SERVANTS. Forty-third Thousand. With Eight Illustrations. Royal 16mo. price 1s. 6d.

LOST GIP. Fifty-ninth Thousand. With Six Illustrations. Royal 16mo. price 1s. 6d.

* * *Also a handsomely bound Edition, with Twelve Illustrations, price 2s. 6d.*

STRETTON (Hesba)—cont.

DAVID LLOYD'S LAST WILL. With Four Illustrations. Royal 16mo. price 2s. 6d.

THE WONDERFUL LIFE. Thirteenth Thousand. Fcap. 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

A NIGHT AND A DAY. With Frontispiece. Twelfth Thousand. Royal 16mo. limp cloth, price 6d.

FRIENDS TILL DEATH. With Illustrations and Frontispiece. Twenty-fourth Thousand. Royal 16mo. price 1s. 6d.; limp cloth, price 6d.

TWO CHRISTMAS STORIES. With Frontispiece. Twenty-first Thousand. Royal 16mo. limp cloth, price 6d.

MICHEL LORIO'S CROSS, AND LEFT ALONE. With Frontispiece. Fifteenth Thousand. Royal 16mo. limp cloth, price 6d.

OLD TRANSCOME. With Frontispiece. Sixteenth Thousand. Royal 16mo. limp cloth, price 6d.

* * Taken from 'The King's Servants.' **THE WORTH OF A BABY,** and How Apple-Tree Court was Won. With Frontispiece. Nineteenth Thousand. Royal 16mo. limp cloth, price 6d.

SUNNYLAND STORIES. By the Author of 'Aunt Mary's Bran Pie.' Illustrated. Small 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

WHITAKER (Florence)—CHRISTY'S INHERITANCE. A London Story. Illustrated. Royal 16mo. price 1s. 6d.

ZIMMERN (H.)—STORIES IN PRECIOUS STONES. With Six Illustrations. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

CONTENTS OF THE VARIOUS VOLUMES IN THE COLLECTED EDITIONS OF MR. TENNYSON'S WORKS.

THE IMPERIAL LIBRARY EDITION, COMPLETE IN SEVEN OCTAVO VOLUMES.

Cloth, price 10s. 6d. per vol.; 12s. 6d. Roxburgh binding.

CONTENTS.

Vol. I.—MISCELLANEOUS POEMS.
II.—MISCELLANEOUS POEMS.
III.—PRINCESS, AND OTHER
POEMS.

Vol. IV.—IN MEMORIAM and MAUD.
V.—IDYLLS OF THE KING.
VI.—IDYLLS OF THE KING.
VII.—DRAMAS.

Printed in large, clear, old-faced type, with a Steel Engraved Portrait of the Author, the set complete, cloth, price £3. 12s. 6d.; or Roxburgh half-morocco, price £4. 7s. 6d.

* * * *The handsomest Edition published.*

THE AUTHOR'S EDITION, IN SIX VOLUMES. Bound in cloth, 38s. 6d.

CONTENTS.

Vol. I.—EARLY POEMS and ENGLISH
IDYLLS. 6s.
II.—LOCKSLEY HALL, LUCRE-
TIUS, and other Poems. 6s.
III.—THE IDYLLS OF THE KING,
complete. 7s. 6d.

Vol. IV.—THE PRINCESS and MAUD. 6s.
V.—ENOCH ARDEN and IN
MEMORIAM. 6s.
VI.—QUEEN MARY and HAROLD
7s.

This Edition can also be had bound in half-morocco, Roxburgh, price 1s. 6d. per vol. extra.

THE CABINET EDITION, COMPLETE IN TWELVE VOLUMES. Price 2s. 6d. each.

CONTENTS.

Vol. I.—EARLY POEMS. Illustrated with
a Photographic Portrait of Mr.
Tennyson.

II.—ENGLISH IDYLLS, and other
POEMS. Containing an Engraving
of Mr. Tennyson's Residence at
Aldworth.

III.—LOCKSLEY HALL, and other
POEMS. With an Engraved
Picture of Farringford.

IV.—LUCRETIUS, and other POEMS.
Containing an Engraving of a Scene
in the Garden at Swainston.

V.—IDYLLS OF THE KING. With
an Autotype of the Bust of Mr.
Tennyson by T. Woolner, R.A.

Vol. VI.—IDYLLS OF THE KING. Illus-
trated with an Engraved Portrait of
'Elaine,' from a Photographic Study
by Julia M. Cameron.
VII.—IDYLLS OF THE KING. Con-
taining an Engraving of 'Arthur,'
from a Photographic Study by Julia
M. Cameron.
VIII.—THE PRINCESS. With an En-
graved Frontispiece.
IX.—MAUD and Enoch Arden.
With a Picture of 'Maud,' taken
from a Photographic Study by Julia
M. Cameron.
X.—IN MEMORIAM. With a Steel
Engraving of Arthur H. Hallam,
engraved from a picture in possession
of the Author, by J. C. Armytage.
XI.—QUEEN MARY: a Drama. With
Frontispiece by Walter Crane.
XII.—HAROLD: a Drama. With Frontis-
piece by Walter Crane.

* * * *These Volumes may be had separately, or the Edition complete, in a handsome ornamental
case, price 32s.*

THE MINIATURE EDITION, IN THIRTEEN VOLUMES.

CONTENTS.

Vol. I.—POEMS.
II.—POEMS.
III.—POEMS.
IV.—IDYLLS OF THE KING.
V.—IDYLLS OF THE KING.
VI.—IDYLLS OF THE KING.

Vol. VII.—IDYLLS OF THE KING.
VIII.—IN MEMORIAM.
IX.—PRINCESS.
X.—MAUD.
XI.—ENOCH ARDEN.
XII.—QUEEN MARY.

VOL. XIII.—HAROLD.

Bound in imitation vellum, ornamented in gilt and gilt edges, in case, price 42s.
This Edition can also be had in plain binding and case, price 36s.

Spottiswoode & Co., Printers, New-street Square, London.



